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,

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 4.5 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 family planning 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 rollover 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
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 consid-
erate of their time, their thoughts, and their efforts also.

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 are prohibited from buying a fire-
arm are listed in the national instant crimi-
nal background check system and require a
background check for every firearm sale, and

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I have enjoyed working with Senator MUR-
RAY. 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 num-
ber of things. Our differences on the finan-
cial future of America is quite dif-
ficult.

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 dif-
ficult.

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, cre-
ate 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 chair-
man, by $1 trillion—$885 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 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 addi-
tional part. Regardless, $1 trillion in new taxes is a huge tax increase.

In January of this year, the Presi-
dent got a $600 billion tax increase on the
rich. Plus there is $1 trillion in tax in-
crease 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 tril-
ion. That is not healthy for the econ-
omy.

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 cen-
tral government. The central govern-
ment is not managing the people’s money well. We have seen it ap-
pears from this budget, in listening to the American people and running their government better, leaner, more pro-
ductive, 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 hon-
estly 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 use the word “balance.” I think it suggests a guilty conscience myself because the budget in no way comes close to balancing a
Everyone who has been involved or who has participated—whether it is the Gang of Six 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, 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’t keep 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 discussed 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 children. 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 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 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 it better. It ought to be discussed open 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 you go 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 people’s incomes, that is, 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 credits 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 we can do is that 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 jobs, help them 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 the workers. That’s what the businesses are saying. We don’t have enough workers. There all ought to say 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, 80 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. 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 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 clear policy vision and work to fix the economy on a sound footing.

What we should do is lay out a sound framework for the future, for an economy that is 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 that will be 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 sound framework for the future, for an economy that is 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 that will be perceived as the financial goal of somebody on Wall Street at that moment. We are not able to do that.

Finally, this budget increases spending. It increases spending very dramatically at a time when we don’t need to be 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 path of spending growth that is going up, and if 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.

The falsification 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—raises taxes $1 trillion and cuts $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. 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 that 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 investments—they are saying all of those 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, I 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 from the other end, 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 too high. Mr. President, if we consider what 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 increased taxes to go 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 the government under control. 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 period—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 other countries are in that zone, 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 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 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. 47

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-Congress 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, pay paycheck fairness so we don’t have to go to court to 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 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 act should be one of them. Too often, too women and other colleagues have fought for paycheck fairness. Under that act, no longer will 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. Employer 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 living longer and dying too. Perhaps 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 fights 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
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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 pro-growth. 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 the broad path forward—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 that bracket, 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, and 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 Administration’s priorities or 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 the regular tax and spending 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 are designed to cut the 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, 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—let me 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 companion spending cuts 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 debt down 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 we 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, 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, the Republican party does not support 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 voucher program for those 55 and under—at a 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 unreal- istic. 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 rates, 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 his stirring remarks and, indeed, his powerful arguments against this Nation going down the road of Greece and Spain.

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—negative 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...
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 unable to get health insurance, 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 dollar bills, as they see 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 the threat of having to cut their workforce because of the law.

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

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
counting those who have given up looking 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 by breaking 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 to say, 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 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 evaluations 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 Run 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—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 tough 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 tax 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 deficit of 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 unsustainable. This is the very definition of the problem we have that spending to grow with 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 the other side has never balanced 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 promise 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 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 nothing. 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 we get it improved. 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 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.

I am 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 and start 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 do not 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 going to be. That is the way 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 this 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 5 or 6 minutes to the Senator from Iowa.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I invite all my colleagues, because we are 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 these reservations and private lease.

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 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 college and student loans? One person 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 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—her father—her father went to jail for fraud and abuse in it, and it needs to be fixed. We had no growth last quarter—zero. The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I want to thank you for your 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. 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 waste—wasteful program. He said 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 it 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 on this.

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 cut this 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 our country, then America is 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 eliminated. They need 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 business 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 balance.

The other thing I would suggest to my colleague from Alabama is that in fact, this budget doesn't balance in 10 years. In fact, it doesn't balance.

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 Republican budgets. These 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 everything from 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 $260 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, 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 employment 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 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 here 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 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 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 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 middle-class Americans who 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 the government and cutting spending. This is going to hit and penetrate middle-class families. 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 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 that is the opposite of the appetite 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 3.5 percent and one-third. 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 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. President, I rise today to seek support for an amendment to the budget resolution that would address the issue of low-altitude 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 Iowa, other states. 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 the EPA administrator. 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 intrusive 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 our farm state Senators for crying over spilled milk. But, I believe that the people who work hard every day to put food on the plates of millions of people are being spied on and not told EPA to release information to their constituents. EPA 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 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 find themselves literally fighting 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 well with farmers 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 issue. It 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 clear.

I ask my Colleagues to support this amendment.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire, Ms. AYOTTE, has filed Senate amendment No. 101, 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 chair, Mr. BEGICH, is 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 announced its plan to cancel the program, 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 our armed forces, 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 the government 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 has imposed another $1.7 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't.

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 progrrowth budget is the only way to 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.

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 $2.20 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. 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 tell the 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. They 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 pre-school are more likely to succeed. We have special education professionals and advocates for students with disabilities. They know quality early learning is absolutely essential 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 selling 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 that President Obama and the leadership 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 uniforms and sharpening pencils. In the 1960s, 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 the quality early 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. 438

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 $74 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 incentives 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 the 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 support efforts 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 NIH. Our families have the opportunity to break through 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.
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, groundbreaking medical breakthrough 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 hospitals so much money. 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 servicemen 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 investment from 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. She is able to lead an active life, 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 fell 20 percent from 2004 to 2012. 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 researchers are leaving the U.S. and enlisting 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 10 years, including critical 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 home 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 economic output that develops around research, such as biotech companies that provide supplies, food services and restaurants, building construction, 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 support for NIH projects 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.

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

'We are going to lose 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 agencies to lay off some researchers and to slow down research. Some promising projects will be terminated, sending 14,000 researchers in the U.S. to Japan for 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.'

Professor Mark Feinberg, a researcher and professor at Northwestern University’s Feinberg School of Medicine, says: Dr. Teresa Woodruff, a researcher and professor at Northwestern University’s Feinberg School of Medicine. Dr. Woodruff is leading one of the first major research projects to understand how 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 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 staff.

The percent of NIH grants being awarded, and the group of researchers most impacted by this cut is young scientists. 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 drastic cut 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 reach a total of $2.6 billion cut, meaning 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 would 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 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 doesn’t make sense for—patients, local wards of scientific research. These cuts for people like Emily. Disinvestment 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 ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a list of organizations that support my amendment.

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

**ORGANIZATION THAT SUPPORT THE DURBIN-MORAN NIH AMENDMENT**

ResearchAmerica
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 Professionals
Schools
Grohn’s and Colitis Foundation of America
Dietetic Disease National Coalition
Dystonia Medical Research Foundation
GBS/CIDP Foundation International
International Association 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

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. MURRAY. 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 both Federal and state governments. What I 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 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’s 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 funds 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, the amendment ensures that 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.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, this is my 18th minute. 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.

Second, we must remember when we were 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. Mrs. MURRAY said 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. The 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 family and I were five 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 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. His three sisters went to college on Pell grants and scholarships. At that time the full Pell grant paid for 85 percent of a public
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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. My kids went to school at the University of California at San Diego. I asked him if he had heard of the Interstate Highway System. He had. The Interstate Highway System was the first satellites; it was the Defense Department. I asked him if he knew who put up the satellite. 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 boots straps in this country. Sometimes people who put up the boots for my wife, 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 who testified 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 CSPAN, as we are right now, the Cable Satellite Affair 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. 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. 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. 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. 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 between the President and the House Republicans. That is what I used to do. They barely made it. Sometimes there wasn’t enough food on the table. Sometimes they turned the phone off, but they made it.

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 go so the President will support 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 the deficit 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.

We are trying to preserve that. We are trying to preserve that. We are trying to preserve that. We are trying to preserve that. We are trying to preserve that. We are trying to preserve that. We are trying to preserve that. We are trying to preserve that. We are trying to preserve that. We are trying to preserve that. We are trying to preserve that. We are trying to preserve that. We are trying to preserve that. We are trying to preserve that. We are trying to preserve that. We are trying to preserve that. We are trying to preserve that. We are trying to preserve that. We are trying to preserve that. We are trying to preserve that. We are trying to preserve that. We are trying to preserve that. We are trying to preserve that. We are trying to preserve that. We are trying to preserve that. We are trying to preserve that. We are trying to preserve that. We are trying to preserve that. We are trying to preserve that. We are trying to preserve that. We are trying to preserve 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.

The 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 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. Our budget dedicates us in a way that will promote growth and prosperity.

I have also filed several amendments that reflect priorities for Minnesota—particularly, 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 this morning, 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 knowledge that the Senate from Minnesota has focused on. We on this side do deeply understand the need to manage our debt and deficit responsibly. 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, whether we have to delve 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 budget.

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. MUKULSKI.

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator MUKULSKI, 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 workplace 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 like colleagues to support the Mikulski amendment. It sets the goal of equal pay for equal work. Fortunately, it does not specify any coercive 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 my colleagues, let's not increase 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 have, 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 Vermont.

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
Ayotte
Barrasso
Blumenthal
Boozman
Burr
Chambliss
Coburn
Cochran
Collins
Corker
Cardin
Carper
Cowan
Cochran
Collins
Corker
Cornyn
Crapo
Cruz
YEAS—54

Baldwin
Baucus
Begich
Benjamin
Biemann
Boxer
Brown
Cantwell
Cardin
Carrer
Cassidy
Casey
Coons
Cowan
Donnelly
Durbin
Feinstein
Franken
Gillibrand

NAYS—54

Alexander
Ayotte
Barrasso
Blumenthal
Boxer
Brown
Cantwell
Cardin
Carper
Cowan
Cochran
Collins
Corker
Cornyn
Crapo
Cruz

[Rollcall Vote No. 51 Leg.]

YEAS—45

Alexander
Ayotte
Barrasso
Blount
Boozman
Burr
Chambliss
Coats
Coburn
Collins
Corker
Cornyn
Crapo
Cruz

NAYS—54

Baldwin
Baucus
Begich
Benjamin
Biemann
Boxer
Brown
Cantwell
Cardin
Carrer
Cassidy
Casey
Coons
Cowan
Donnelly
Durbin
Feinstein
Franken
Gillibrand

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 absent.

By the way, that is above and beyond the huge tax increases my colleagues imposed when they voted for ObamaCare—the $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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been requested. The bill clerk will 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 99, nays 54, as follows: [Rollcall Vote No. 53 Leg.]

[YEAS—45]

Alexander  
Alexander  
Ayotte  
Ayotte  
Baldwin  
Baldwin  
Barrao  
Barrao  
Baucus  
Baucus  
Begich  
Begich  
Bennet  
Bennet  
Blumenthal  
Blinn  
Boozman  
Boozman  
Boozman  
Boozman  
Boozman  
Boxer  
Boxer  

[NOT VOTING—1]

Hampshire, Mrs. SHAHEEN.

Mr. LENTZ. I announce that the amendment No. 439 offered by the Senator from New Hampshire, Mrs. Shaheen, is necessarily absent.

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  
Alexander  
Ayotte  
Ayotte  
Baldwin  
Baldwin  
Barrao  
Barrao  
Baucus  
Baucus  
Begich  
Begich  
Bennet  
Bennet  
Blumenthal  
Blinn  
Boozman  
Boozman  
Boozman  
Boozman  
Boozman  
Boozman  
Boxer  
Boxer  

[NOT VOTING—1]

Hampshire, Mrs. SHAHEEN.

Mr. LENTZ. I announce that the amendment No. 439 offered by the Senator from New Hampshire, Mrs. Shaheen, is necessarily absent.

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 99, nays 54, as follows: [Rollcall Vote No. 53 Leg.]

[YEAS—99]

Alexander  
Alexander  
Ayotte  
Ayotte  
Baldwin  
Baldwin  
Barrao  
Barrao  
Baucus  
Baucus  
Begich  
Begich  
Bennet  
Bennet  
Blumenthal  
Blinn  
Boozman  
Boozman  
Boozman  
Boozman  
Boozman  
Boozman  
Boxer  
Boxer  

[NOT VOTING—1]

Hampshire, Mrs. SHAHEEN.

Mr. LENTZ. I announce that the amendment No. 222 offered by the Senator from Idaho, Mr. Crafo, is necessarily absent.

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. Crafo.

Mr. Crafo. 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 rejected. It was defeated then by a claim rejected.
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. JOHANNS. 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 neces-sarily 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

Alexander
Ayotte
Barrasso
Boozman
Burr
Chambliss
Coats
Cochran
Cowan

Flake
Graham
Gran defy
Hatch
Heiler
Hoeven
Inhofe
Isakson
Johanns
Johnson (WI)
Lee
Manchin
McCain
McConnell
McMoran
Paul
Portman
Risch
Rounds
Rubio
Scott
Sessions
Shelby
Thune
Toomey
Vitter
Wicker

NAYS—43

Baldwin
Baucus
Behring
Benet
Blumenthal
Boxer
Brown
Cantwell
Cardin
Carper
Casey
Collins
Coons
Cowan
Cowan
Donnelly
Donnelly
Durbin
Feinstein
Franken
Gilibrand
Grassley
Graham
Griffith
Hagerty
Harkin
Hatch
Hirono
Johnson (SD)
Kaine
King
Kirk
Kristol
Landrieu
Leahy
Lesan
Logan
McCaskill
Menendez
Merkey
Mikulski
Moranowski
Murphy
Nelson
Ney
Pryor
Reed
Reid
Rockefeller
Sanders
Schatz
Schumer
Shaheen
Stabenow
Tester
Toomey
Whitehouse
Wyden

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 go.

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 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 $95 billion increase in our debt over 10 years. The growth 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 a rate faster than our economy, at a rate faster than personal income.

The net deficit reduction over the next 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.

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 $95 billion increase in our debt over 10 years. The growth 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 a rate faster than our economy, at a rate faster than personal income.

The net deficit reduction over the next 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.

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 $95 billion increase in our debt over 10 years. The growth 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 a rate faster than our economy, at a rate faster than personal income.

The net deficit reduction over the next 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.

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 $95 billion increase in our debt over 10 years. The growth 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 a rate faster than our economy, at a rate faster than personal income.

The net deficit reduction over the next 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 in 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 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 $465 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 a rate faster than our economy, at a rate faster than personal income.

The net deficit reduction over the next 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 in 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 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 $465 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 a rate faster than our economy, at a rate faster than personal income.

The net deficit reduction over the next 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.
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 1 1/2 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 first 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 18 food programs, 18 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 of disabled 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 for the able-bodied 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 space, 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 said 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 that is 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 Justice Department, 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, how do we run 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. 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 of the agency and then 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. 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 programs, 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 have to do anything—they have to talk to the Department of Education too, because they are interconnected 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.

I 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.

Job training 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 here is 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 other people know. 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.

Let me use another. 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.
waste $200 billion a year. I do not know what they are doing—none of that. This is all ignored.

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. The estimate is that we send out $760 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 homework, I believe in the 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 oversaw 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 to eliminate 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 doing that 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 hard work of eliminating the duplication.

I did not show the housing. I showed the total amount we spend. Do you realize we 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. We deny our oath when we do that, but we also deny the best tendencies and the tradition of this country. We can make a whole lot more with a whole lot less money if we would take care of this problem. But leadership is lacking in 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 from—what 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 an inspector 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, and you will need a strong anti-emetic for the rest of the week if you read the waste and fraud and abuse and the stuff we are 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 a year. 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 that has a lot of my sincere 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 because we will not do the hard work of eliminating 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.

(Disruption in the Visitors’ Gallery)

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
said: I know I am preaching to the
then our minister is going full steam
ator from Delaware.
Senator from Delaware.
ranking member from Oklahoma, this
Homeland Security and Government
This has been an extraordinary passion
friend, the Senator from Delaware.
knows all of the programs that run
Not one other Federal agency actually
done a great job. I compliment them.
the Federal Government that knows all
list of all of the various programs.
this because we have talked about this
grams they have in their agency?
Does the Senator know the number of
through the Chair, take a question?
for the dollar.
think they are not getting good value
where the actual agencies themselves
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,

Mr. WARNER. I turn now to my good
Mr. WARNER. I know the answer
Mr. WARNER. I know the answer
to be at least 47 programs. We still had
and were not able at the State
level to consolidate into a more
meaningful approach.
I recall when I first came to
this body that one of the things
we were really good at was
find low-hanging fruit, and we found
those programs that both the Bush admin-
istration and the Obama administration
had agreed were duplicative and unnec-
essary—16 programs, $1 billion; but a
billion here and a billion there and you
are talking 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 Government Performance
Results Modernization Act. In that
dollar, the Government
on that, and the Government
on that, and even the choir, but even
choirs need to be
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
pointed to by Senator 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. They put
you, and 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, 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
defense 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 is actu-
ally—where they actually drop their
spending is in that money. That in-
cludes workforce development, it in-
cludes education, it includes infra-
structure—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 percen-
tage 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 percen-
tage of GDP in this country, we are the
green line. What we see from 1961 down
about to 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 one of the
highest in the world, 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 spend-
ing continues to grow. We have got
to do something about that. The discre-
tionary spending part of our budget has
grown. We have got to do something
about that. Nondefense discretionary
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 com-
mittee—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 back on defense,
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 def-
cit—not as big as this. But they adopt-
ed 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 bud-
gets in a row. The budget that comes
out of the Budget Committee is similar
to the Clinton budget in that it is dollar
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
decision about how much
we are spending, it is very important
that we understand how much
everything we do. So even the choir
of whom we are a part of this
cornerstone of our church. Everyone 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.
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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 responsibility of the Budget 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 process 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 emerge 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.

Mr. Sessions. 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 purposes 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 would 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 full-time workers required 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 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. 458. 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 small business owners. It would be 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 impact on small businesses and job growth before imposing new rules and 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 coverage 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 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 co-sponsoring 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 by requiring the long-overdue implementation of financial management, internal controls, and updated program integrity protocols at the Employment and Training Administration.

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

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. Mr. President, the Senator from Alabama if the Senator from Virginia may speak for 10 minutes? I see the Senator has some speakers on this 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 getting America’s democracy 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 effort. 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. I still 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 revenue side of the issue. As a business guy, I find that troubling. I disagree. There are a number of areas where we need to cut back spending.

Look at revenues. I still think anyone on either side wants to be taxed more than is necessary.
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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 the Senate and House 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 do something 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, what does this side of aisle propose? Have they said, You know, we need to go to the spending side 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 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 to the spending side 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 $1.57 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 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, anywhere in 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 grandchildren.

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 Oklahoma.

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 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 $5 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—"A foolish 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 $56 million. It is interesting that in the budget that came over from the House it was $56 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 today 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 should the United States continue to trade arms with our allies—any allies such as Israel, as an example.

So I have an amendment—amendment No. 189—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 multi-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.

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 pretty closely mirrors what we are saying are we 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 the Federal banks. So the problem is, 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:


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

Mr. DEAR PATTY and SENATOR SESSIONS, Chairman and Ranking Member, Committee on the Budget, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

Dear Patty and Jeff:

In accordance with your request, we are sending 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. 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 $355.5 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 sequestration actions, was developed pursuant to a new defense strategy released in January 2012. We anticipate that meeting our national security requirements and providing for our military personnel and 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 out-year budgetary resources. We support a national defense budget that is consistent with the national security needs of the United States.

The Committee recognizes the requirement pursuant to section 411 of the fiscal year 2010 budget resolution that directed Committees to review programs in non-defense discretionary areas to eliminate waste, fraud, and abuse, and to include recommendations for improving government performance. Last year, the Committee was responsible for 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 military facilities projects; prohibited the obligation or expenditure of FY 2013 funds for the Medium Extended Air Defense System eliminating a $473.0 million expenditure; cut $190.0 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 X-46A aircraft propulsion technology.

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 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 restricting the use of cost-type contracts for the production of major weapon systems; enhancing protections for contractor employee whistle-blowers; 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.
- Requires the Secretary of Defense to ensure an appropriate link between contracts and performance. The Secretary of Defense shall:
  - Establish a plan for contractor performance of critical functions in support of overseas contingency operations;
  - Develop a plan for contractor performance of critical functions in support of overseas contingency operations;
  - Develop a plan for contractor performance of critical functions in support of overseas contingency operations.
- Requires DOD and other agencies to conduct risk assessments and take steps to mitigate the significant risks to contractor performance.

The FY 2014 NDAA will build on the FY 2013 NDAA by including a number of recommendations to improve defense contracting and reduce waste in the operations of the Department of Defense.
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. Additionally, 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—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 and eliminating 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 included in the budget request will not be sufficient to meet our current national security requirements. We may wish to amend our recommendations after receipt of the budget request, and will work 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.

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 from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, tomorrow marks the third anniversary of the Affordable Care 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 return our budget to balanced, and then 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 fail and over-all 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 those who work for the business, 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.

In 2012, 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-six percent 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 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 and should achieve 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 pass a bill that replaces the current health care law with more sensible alternatives.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, 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 dreams; it fails to confront, or reform and put on a safe path our important Social Security and Medicare Programs, both of which are head- ing 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 does one thing: It 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. We are going to cut spending $1 trillion by this 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, reducing 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 fiscal cliff.

ObamaCare 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 so 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 is all unbalances. It is all unbalanced. It is all out of balance. 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 John Roberts, the then Staff Director 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 shell- laking, 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 2010 election. So what did they decide to do? They just said it would balance. They said we are only going to give you 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
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 afterthought 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.

Mr. SESSIONS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will 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 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 that have convened task forces to develop the conditions 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 ensures 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 straightforward 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 his 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 freedom—are not turned away from receiving services if they are with their parents 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.

Mrs. MURRAY. 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, 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 cannot ignore.

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. Her parents expected her to go to college and she herself, 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, Fosold War had 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 interests 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 Senate budget that we are about to adopt 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 terrible 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 through American 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 great-est 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 they will 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 takes the $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牌 label, including our 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 families.

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 Snowe pointed out on the floor so well yesterday, Medicare is vital to the health and well-being of more than 50 million seniors and Americans 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. I urge my Senate colleagues 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 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 urge my colleagues to do the same.
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 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 unsound fiscal policy 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. 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. 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 Shaysheen No. 438 be the following: Menendez No. 651, Coburn No. 499, 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 other 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 in block; 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 second-degree 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 of Wyoming. 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. JOHANNES, 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 preventative care, and to protect religious rights of conscience)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:
SEC. 3. 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 preventative 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 bill clerk called the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment (No. 630) was reconsidered.

The amendment (No. 630) was rejected.

The amendment (No. 630) was rejected.

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 amendment (No. 651) is as follows:

(Purpose: To call for a comprehensive approach for wage index reform)

The amendment was as follows:

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:

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 amendment to Senator COBURN’s amendment. 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 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 a few States by reducing payments to other rural hospitals.

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
Baucus
Bech
Bennet
Blumenthal
Boxer
Brown
Cantwell
Cardin
Casper
Coons
Cowan
Donnelly
Durbin

Alexander
Ayotte
Barrasso
Burr
Chambliss
Coats
Cochran
Collins
Corzine
Corker
Cornyn
Crapo
Fischer

Flake
Graham
Grassley
Hagan
Hatch
Helms
Hoeven
Inhofe
Isakson
Johnson (WI)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson (WI)

Mikulski
Murphy
Nelson
Pryor
Reed
Rockefeller
Sanders
Schumer
Shaheen
Stabenow

McConnell
Moran
Markowski
Paul
Portman
Risch
Roberts
Rubio
Scott
Sessions
Shelby
Thune
Toomey

WHITEHOUSE

Wyden

NAYS—50

McConnell
Moran
Markowski
Paul
Portman
Risch
Roberts
Rubio
Scott
Sessions
Shelby
Thune
Toomey

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 reads 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 establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to respond to budget cuts affecting Medicare, and to provide for the payment of Medicare payments to rural hospitals."

The amendment 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 neutral 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.]
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 sleepwalking. 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 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 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, 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. 4. 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 on suspension 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 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, and violating the rule that the cost of a product should be in its price. Nonrepeatable 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.

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.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAES—53</th>
<th>NAYS—46</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>Fischer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayotte</td>
<td>Flake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrasso</td>
<td>Graham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennet</td>
<td>Grassley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blunt</td>
<td>Hatch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boozman</td>
<td>Harkin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burr</td>
<td>Heitkamp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chambliss</td>
<td>Hoenen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coburn</td>
<td>Inhofe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cochran</td>
<td>Isakson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collins</td>
<td>Johnson (WI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corker</td>
<td>Kirk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornyn</td>
<td>Landrieu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crapo</td>
<td>Leach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruz</td>
<td>Manchin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donnelly</td>
<td>McCain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enzi</td>
<td>McCain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillibrand</td>
<td>Nelson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McConnell</td>
<td>Moran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murphy</td>
<td>Nunn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAYS—46</td>
<td>Reid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed</td>
<td>Reid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risch</td>
<td>Reisch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rusty</td>
<td>Sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanders</td>
<td>Schatz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schummer</td>
<td>Shaheen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schatz</td>
<td>Sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sessions</td>
<td>Tester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Udall (CO)</td>
<td>Udall (NM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Udall (NM)</td>
<td>Warner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren</td>
<td>Whitehouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wicker</td>
<td>Wyden</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 622.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk reads 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, 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 2019 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 Senator 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.]
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 at this 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 each 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 yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator call up the amendment?

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I call up the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will report the amendment.

The bill clerk reads as follows:

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. HOEVEN], for himself, Mr. BAUCCUS, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. ROBERTS, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. BARRASSO, Ms. LANDRIEU, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. BEHZDI, proposes amendment numbered 494.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to promote investment and job growth in the 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, aggregate, 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 this 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 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.]
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 may I understand correctly?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DURBIN. Does the Senator mind if I say a word 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 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 spoken to everyone on the other side.

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. Senator Baucus, 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? Have we sunk to a new low where we say to taxes?

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 the 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, how they should direct it, 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 the same way as if I had walked into his store. 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 no 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 about 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 the same law to enforce State and local use tax law and collect sales tax, and, therefore, businesses in California don't collect sales tax, but they 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.

Exactly. It says a person in California the same law to enforce State and local use tax law and collect sales tax, and, therefore, businesses in California don't collect sales tax, but they 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.

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 that are just having 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, change is running wild 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. It says 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. Why then have the 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.

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 in that they 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 administration 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 American for Tax Reform 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 moving forward 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. 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 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.

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.
Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, how much time remains on each side? The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana has 7 minutes, the Senator from Wyoming has 5 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 stop putting the rest of the amendments on the screen. 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 now 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 auditing 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 tax 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 has 5 minutes. Mr. BAUCUS. 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 saddled 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. The Durbin 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 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, 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. The Senator from New Hampshire. Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to my colleague from New Hampshire, Ms. SHAHEEN.

Ms. 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 this. 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 a disadvantage that he could not continue to grow. Just as Senator WYDEN said, what these businesses are going to do is 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 amendment will require. Our small businesses to collect taxes from other States. This is an incredible violation. It changes the entire standard 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 impose sales tax on our behalf 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-creating 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 tax 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 New Hampshire. Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to my colleague from New Hampshire, Senator SHAHEEN, and the other opponents of this amendment.

Senator ALEXANDER said that States should be able to decide what to do about this. 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 a disadvantage that he could not continue to grow. Just as Senator WYDEN said, what these businesses are going to do is 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 the Senator 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 amendment will require. Our small businesses to collect taxes from other States. This is an incredible violation. It changes the entire standard 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 impose sales tax on our behalf 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-creating 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 tax 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 stop putting the rest of the amendments on the screen. 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 now 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 auditing like we have never seen before. Who pays for it?
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. That 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 that you are 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 do 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 Wisconsin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WYDEN. I will be very brief. Under this amendment, we could not touch an online retailer that is wholesales 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 raising the bar with physical presence. But if you are wholesales overseas, an online Internet retailer shipping into this country, you get a free ride under this legislation. That is why it is 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. This 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 how the tax laws are. 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 here bought 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 will 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? 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 Montana.

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 proposed. 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 several minutes for our time, Mr. President.

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-Durban-Alexander amendment to oppose the Ayotte amendment because she includes a provision in that amendment which absolutely destroys the whole effort here. That provision 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 think she will explain to you what it means—what it means in comparison to their States across the country, on the other side of the country; places where they have nothing to do with. That is the nexus.

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 if it were found that foreign entities falling 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 foreign 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 over 100,000 Internet retail sellers 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 would I 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 laws say 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 Illinois.
Mr. ALEXANDER. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I want to yield to the Senator from Illinois—"and then it was dark."

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. ALEXANDER. 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 our economic interests, 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 that 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 Internet. Internet sales are the only way to abide by the laws of Illinois, for goodness’ sake, make our sales elsewhere. 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. What is said is this: if you sell something in another State and have 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 Ohio, 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 Montana, Utah, or wherever. 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. One minute remains.

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.
should be done. 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 Enzý 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 would not hold water. 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 Enzý-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 Enzý 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
Balbín
Bennett
Blumenthal
Baucus
Boozman
Boxer
Brown
Burr
Cantwell
Cardin
Carper
Casey
Chambliss
Collins
Cochran
Corker
Crapo
Corker
Coons
Donnelly
Durbin
Enzi
Flake

MENENDES
Fischer
Gillibrand
Graham
Hagan
Harkin
Heinrich
Hirono
Hoekstra
Isakson
Johnson (WI)
Johnson (SD)
Johanns
Johnson (SI)
Johnson (WY)
Kaine
Kirk
Klobuchar
Landrieu
Leahy
Levin
McCain
McCaskill
Merkley

NAYS—24

Ayotte
Barraca
Baucus
Coats
Corry
Crus

Grassley
Hatch
Hatch
Inhofe
Lane
McConnell

MURKOWSKI
Paul
Roberts
Rubio

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.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. President, my amendment would allow for legislation...
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. Therefore, we should not 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 amendment (No. 341) was agreed to.

Mr. BEGICH. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 341.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The amendment is as follows:

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 and monoclonal fish 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.

I urge support for this amendment and ask it be passed.

I yield time to Senator MURKOWSKI.

Mr. MERKLEY. 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.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to lay on the table was disagreed to.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I believe we can pass this amendment on a voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. 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. Mr. President, I believe we can pass this amendment on a voice vote, unless there is an objection.

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.

The motion to lay on the table 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 disagreed to.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 398.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate from Oregon.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, 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 reads as follows:

The amendment is as follows:

(Provide: 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to the vote on amendment No. 396.

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 preparatory to being able to run this country, to have the adequate infrastructures 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

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates or other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, 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 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 that point 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 so the money can be used 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 be then be taken and spent in 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, Rzuce 
Baucus, Frank 
Begich, Hagan 
Bennet, Harkin 
Bingaman, Heinrich 
Boxer, Klobuchar 
Brown, Johnson (SD) 
Cantwell, Murray 
Cardin, King 
Carper, Reid 
Casey, Schumer 
Coons, Shaheen 
Cowan, Manchin 
Durbin, Stabenow 
Feinstein, Tester 

NAYS—60

Baldwin, Fischer 
Baucus, Frank 
Begich, Hagan 
Bennet, Harkin 
Bingaman, Heinrich 
Boxer, Klobuchar 
Brown, Johnson (WI) 
Cantwell, Murray 
Cardin, King 
Casey, Schumer 
Coons, Shaheen 
Cowan, Manchin 
Durbin, Stabenow 
Feinstein, Tester 
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The amendment (No. 515) was rejected.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote, and I move, on reconsideration, to order the motion to lay 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 between the Senator from Florida, Mr. RUBIO, and the Senator from California, Mrs. BOXER. The vote on an 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 call 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 ABORTION NOTIFICATION ACT.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) laws requiring parental notification or consent prior to an abortion, or in the alternative, judicial approval, 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 or consent, it 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 determine 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) 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 obtain 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 physical 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 or 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 such law;

(D) the physician is presented with documentation that shows with a reasonable degree of certainty that a court in the State of residency of the minor 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 achieve 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 a 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 states that, 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 court 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 time. 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 supported by respected doctors’ organizations and many women’s groups.

Colleagues, under the Rubio amendment, a doctor and a grandmother would go jail if the grandmother brought her granddaughter 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 grandchildren.

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:

[Roll Call Vote No. 64 Leg.]
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. 1. 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, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports relating to supporting 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 2023 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 the bill, after the following:

SEC. 2. 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 allocations of a committee or committees, 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 biennial 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 an 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:

[Roll Call Vote No. 65 Leg.]
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.


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, Sessions 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 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 Wisconsin.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, if the clerk could call up the amendments in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendments en bloc.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. 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 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.

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, 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. 373

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to permanently eliminate the Federal estate tax)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 3. 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 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. 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 CP, 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 2023 or the period of the total 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 $115,594,000,000.
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 $115,594,000,000.
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 $159,650,000,000.
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. 692  
(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 $3,000,000,000.
On page 19, line 3, increase the amount by $5,000,000,000.

On page 19, line 7, increase the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 19, line 11, increase the amount by $13,000,000,000.
On page 19, line 15, increase the amount by $13,000,000,000.
On page 19, line 19, increase the amount by $2,000,000,000.
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 $3,000,000,000.
On page 46, line 16, decrease the amount by $5,000,000,000.
On page 46, line 20, decrease the amount by $10,000,000,000.
On page 46, line 24, decrease the amount by $13,000,000,000.
On page 47, line 3, decrease the amount by $13,000,000,000.
On page 47, line 7, decrease the amount by $2,000,000,000.
On page 47, line 11, decrease the amount by $1,000,000,000.
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. 214  
(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. 257  
(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. 2. 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 II of the Budget of the United States Government and until the day the President submits a budget to Congress.

AMENDMENT NO. 696  
(Purpose: To provide the deficit-neutral reserve fund to provide funding for the purposes of embassy or diplomatic security)

At the end of title III, add the following:
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 $3,100,000,000.
- On page 4, line 9, reduce the amount by $2,000,000,000.
- On page 4, line 10, reduce the amount by $3,600,000,000.
- On page 4, line 11, reduce the amount by $3,700,000,000.
- On page 4, line 12, reduce the amount by $1,100,000,000.
- On page 4, line 13, reduce the amount by $1,600,000,000.
- 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 programs 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 $1,600,000,000.
- 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 $3,600,000,000.
- On page 4, line 25, reduce the amount by $3,700,000,000.
- On page 5, line 1, reduce the amount by $1,100,000,000.
- On page 5, line 2, reduce the amount by $1,600,000,000.
- 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.

The levels in this resolution are amended by—Reducing total revenues by the following amounts:

- On page 4, line 9, reduce the amount by $5,100,000,000.
- On page 4, line 10, reduce the amount by $4,800,000,000.
- On page 4, line 11, reduce the amount by $4,400,000,000.
- On page 4, line 12, reduce the amount by $4,100,000,000.
- On page 4, line 13, reduce the amount by $2,000,000,000.
- On page 4, line 14, reduce the amount by $1,400,000,000.
- On page 4, line 15, reduce the amount by $300,000,000.

At the end of SEC. 4, add the following:

SEC. 4. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ENABLE PROMPT ACTION FOR PRESIDENTIAL EXCEPTION FOR MERIDIAN AIR TOXINS STANDARD.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, motions, or conference reports that improve the oral health outcomes for children covered under section 112(i)(4) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7412(i)(4)), without raising new revenue, by the amounts prescribed for such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over 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 concerning 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 SEC. 4, add the following:

SEC. 4. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ENABLE PROMPT ACTION FOR PRESIDENTIAL EXCEPTION FOR MERIDIAN AIR TOXINS STANDARD.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, multi-jurisdictional task forces, technology improvement, and information sharing systems, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2023.)
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.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The motion to lay on the table was rejected.

Mr. WARNER. 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. 307

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.
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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 Vermont.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I believe we can take this on a voice vote.

Mr. SANDERS. If Mr. B URR supports this amendment, I ask for a rollcall vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

At this time, 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 PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

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.

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I rise to offer amendment No. 482, offered by the Senator from Washington, Mr. REED. The amendment consists of three parts. The first part is to waive section 904(c) 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. The amendment is to the pending amendment not germane to the underlying resolution and therefore violates section 305(b)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

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

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. The motion to reconsider is not in order. The amendment (No. 482) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is to the pending amendment not germane to the underlying resolution and therefore violates section 305(b)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. The motion to reconsider is not in order.

The amendment (No. 482) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is to the pending amendment not germane to the underlying resolution and therefore violates section 305(b)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. The motion to reconsider is not in order.
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 Plan. It reformers 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 buring 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 Senate from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment (No. 263) was rejected.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote, and I lay this 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 of debate 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 do is attack 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 483

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Mr. President, the President is fond of calling for a balanced budget that is being offered includes tax savings for the wealthy and eliminates the programs that strengthen our economy and support our middle class.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, the President is fond of calling for a balanced budget for consideration by the Senate.

As we all know, the law requires the President to submit his budget plan by 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. 483) was 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 TO 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, amendments, and improvements between the House, 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 the period of the total of fiscal years 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2023 through 2025.

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. 489

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now 2 minutes equally divided prior to a vote on amendment No. 489, offered by the Senator from Louisiana, Mr. Vitter.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 489.

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.

The 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 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.

YEAR—99

Alexander
Ayotte
Baldwin
Barrasso
Baucus
Bechard
Bennett
Blumenthal
Bingaman
Boozman
Boxer
Brown
Burr
Cantwell
Cardin
Carper
Casey
Chambliss
Coats
Coburn
Cochrane
Collins
Coons
Corker
Corzine
Cowan
Craig
Donnelly
Durbin
Feinstein
Fischer

Flake
Franken
Gillibrand
Graham
Grossman
Hagan
Harkin
Hatch
Heinrich
Hikitsch
Hirono
Hoeven
Inhofe
Isakson
Johnson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (WI)
Kaine
King
Kirk
Klobuchar
Landrieu
Leahy
Levy
Levin
Manchin
McCaskill
McConnell
McIntosh
Merkley
Mikulski

Moran
Markowski
Murphy
Murray
Nelson
Paul
Portman
Pryor
Reed
Risch
Roberts
Rockefeller
Rubio

NOT VOTING—1

Lautenberg

The amendment (No. 489) 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 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 that, 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 nowhere. 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 539

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now 2 minutes equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 539, offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. Toomey.

The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. 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.
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 and is 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 precisely the same.

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.

Mr. SESSIONS. 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. 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 more 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.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAES—45</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayotte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrasso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boozman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chambliss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coburn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cochran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crapo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAYS—54</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baldwin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baucus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blumenthal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boxer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donnelly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durbin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feinstein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gillibrand</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOT VOTING—1

Lautenberg
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. There is a second question?

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 33, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 72 Leg.]

YEAS—46

Alexander
Barasso
Blunt
Boozman
Burr
Chambliss
Coats
Coburn
Cochnaar
Corker
Coryn
Crapo
Cruz
Donnelly
Emt
Fischer

LANDRIGE—Sanders
Leahy—Schatz
Levin—Schumer
McCaskill—Shaheen
Menendez—Stabenow
Merkley—Tester
Mikulski—Udall (CO)
Murphy—Udall (NM)
Nelson—Warner
Reed—Warren
Rockefeller—Whitehouse
Rockefeller

NOT VOTING—1

Lautenberg

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that 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 $74 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 this year 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. LACENBURG) was unusually 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:

YEAS—46

Alexander
Ayotte
Barrasso
Blumenthal
Boozman
Burr
Bouchard
Chambliss
Coats
Colburn
Cooper
Coons
Collins
Johnson (WI)
Corker
Cochran
Chambliss
Burr
Boozman
Blunt

NAYS—53

Baldwin
Baucus
Begich
Bennet
Blumenthal
Boozman
Johnson (SD)
Brown
Cantwell
Cardin
Carper
Casey
Coons
Coons
Cowan
Donnelly
Donnelly
Durbin
Feinstein
Franken
Gillibrand

NAYOTING—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 Pryor, whom we all revere, said, and I will quote:

I once described vote-aramas as pandemonium, which was the Palace of Satan in Milton 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.

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 No. 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 call the roll.

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.

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 No. 597, the majority have the next amendment in order; finally, all these votes be 10-minute votes.

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" after "Union".

SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE PROHIBITION OF TAXPAYER DOLLARS AND RESOURCES SOURCES EMPLOYED 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 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.

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. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE PROHIBITION OF TAXPAYER DOLLARS AND RESOURCES SOURCES EMPLOYED 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 that relate to accelerating the development and deployment of advanced manufacturing technologies, 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.

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 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 every Senator to continue cooperating with us. I appreciate everybody who has been working so hard.
Mr. JOHNSON. Madam President, the budget already includes a deficitneutral reserve fund to assist service members and veterans. It contains a provision supporting the transition of our military to the workforce by recognizing this 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 service member’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 organize 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is pending.

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 know; 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.

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

The motion to lay upon the table was ordered to be 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:

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 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 much less 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 individuals and businesses. Manufacturers oppose an amendment filed by Senator Rob Portman (R-OH) that provides for corporate-only reform. About two-thirds of NAM members are organized as pass-through entities, meaning for and paying estate 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. manufacturers. We strongly support policies to ensure that manufacturers in the United States are the world’s leading innovators. 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 and competitive R&D tax 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 the reform to the tax code that would allow for and paying estate taxes take away important resources from these important job creators. While NAM supports the reform efforts, we are concerned that 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 overseas operations to be more competitive, the NAM supports the 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 medical devices.

By increasing the costs of medical devices, the excise tax—which took effect at the beginning of 2013—hurts the device manufacturers that provide the research and innovation that leads to the development of medical products that contribute to the health and well-being of all Americans. The research and innovation proposed 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 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. This additional cost is 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 expected to be seen this 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, up from 15 percent last year, an increase of over 50 percent.

Manufacturers strongly support the repeal of this burdensome tax that would increase the tax rate 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 to 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 John Barrasso (R-WY) to repeal the employer mandate.

REducing COsts FOR MANufACTURERS

The NAM also supports several amendments that protect manufacturers against efforts to hamper exports of many products, such as cars, tractors, agricultural products, electronics, toys, steel, chemicals, pumps, air conditioners, elevators and airplanes.

For example, the NAM supports amendments that would enhance North American oil and gas production by expanding and accelerating onshore and offshore leasing, as well as amendments from Senators Frank Lautenberg (D-NJ) 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, consumer electronics, toys, steel, chemicals, pumps, air conditioners, elevators and airplanes.

Manufacturers also support an amendment offered by Senator Barrasso (R-WY) to maintain a strong oil and gas pipeline to carry crude oil from Canada and the Bakken field 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. Placing additional costs and delays on 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 United States has relied on foreign imports of these rare earths; as recently as 2009, 96 percent of this supply came from China. Senator Manchin’s amendment, would encourage re-selection into alternate domestic production, 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 filed 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 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. Similar amendments were offered by Senators Jeanne Shaheen (D-NH), Kay Hagan (D-NC) and Bob Casey (D-PA) to support 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

THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

NAM members also support amendments to the budget plan that would improve our current tax system by eliminating job-kill-
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 and a large group of “unit” of greater predictability for offshore resources and operations.

OVERREACH BY NLRB
Manufacturers have long been concerned about 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 that training leading to nationally recognized credentials will help 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.
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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, workforce, and in which nearly 18% of the state’s 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.
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 scientific 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. 39
(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 $20,000,000.
On page 20, line 20, reduce the amount by $10,000,000.
On page 20, line 23, reduce the amount by $20,000,000.
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 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. 706
(Purpose: To increase 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 UNDOCUMENTED 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, motions, or conference reports relating to criminal liability of a 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. 137
(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. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROHIBIT PROMOTIONAL MATERIALS PROMOTING 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 the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to criminal liability of a 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. 619
(Purpose: To 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.)

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.

(1) MODIFICATION OF FUNCTIONAL LEVELS.—
(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) $3,240,000,000 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) $3,240,000,000 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.

(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) $30,000,000 in fiscal year 2015;
(C) $350,000,000 in fiscal year 2016;
(D) $650,000,000 in fiscal year 2017;
(E) $670,000,000 in fiscal year 2018;
(F) $3,015,000,000 in fiscal year 2019;
(G) $1,150,000,000 in fiscal year 2020;
(H) $1,230,000,000 in fiscal year 2021;
(I) $1,300,000,000 in fiscal year 2022; and
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 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment (No. 359) was rejected.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, did I have 30 seconds?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has all time.

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 hill 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 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 original 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 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.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I yield to the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there another Senator who wants to take a voice vote on this?

The time of the Senator has expired.

The amendment (No. 705) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 614

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. There now is 2 minutes equally divided on the motion to agree 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 Republican colleagues would simply say that if you are here illegally, did 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 necessary for the yeas and nays.

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
Ayotte
Barrasso
Blunt
Boxer
Burr
Chambliss
Coats
Coburn
Cochran
Corker
Coryn
Crapo
Cruz
Enzi

McCain
McConnell

NAYS—56

Baldwin
Bechtel
Bennet
Bernsenthal
Boxer
Brown
Canwell
Cardin
Carter
Cassidy
Collins
Cousons
Cowan

Caucasus
Bechtel
Bennet
Bernsenthal
Boxer
Brown
Canwell
Cardin
Carter
Cassidy
Collins
Cousons
Cowan

McKim

"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 are 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 we allowed with the Department of Justice’s decision 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 ordering $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.

At 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’’ and ‘‘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 to have 20 more seconds.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

The time of the Senator has expired.

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 INlichty; and our Democratic sponsors, BURT, WARRIN, BECHT, 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 whole thing about it. Frankly, but 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. 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.

Mr. MERKLEY. 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 tem. 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 tem. 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 prece-dent 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 campaign promoting a law and regulations that a majority of Americans oppose.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tem. 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 condi-tion; 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 tem. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mrs. MURRAY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

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

The amendment (No. 187) was rejected.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tem. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tem. 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 tem. In the opinion of the Chair, the count held.

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 tem. There is 2 minutes equally di-vided 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 co-ordination of our flood mitigation pro-grams to meet the unmet needs of vic-tims 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 en-tire lives now face tens of thousands of dollars in unanticipated costs, all in addition to their rebuilding efforts. 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 coordi-nation and fine tuning of these mitiga-tion programs so they operate more ef-fectively 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 pro-grams in a more wise and coordinated fashion.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tem. 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 edu-ca-tion, clean energy, infrastructure, farm payments, food stamps, health care, pensions, housing, and new 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 pri-orities.

So I think we should do this by voice vote, but I did want to call the atten-tion of my colleagues to the fact that reserve funds too readily used can under-mine the integrity of the budget process.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tem. 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 tem. 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 tem. 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 testing 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 coun-try.

The amendment provides maximum flexibility for the Judiciary Committee in allowing the committee to deter-mine the best way to achieve significant deficit reduction by reforming the current sys-tem. This flexibility, by the way, in-cludes 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. Mr. 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. LATENBERG) 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:

[Kolcall Vote No. 78 Leg.]

YEAS—43

Alexander Fischler Murkowski
Ayotte Flake Paul
Barrasso Grasley Portman
Blunt Hatch Risch
Bouman Hollings Roberts
Burr Hoeven Rubio
Chambliss Inhofe Scott
Coats Jackson Sessions
Cooper Johanns Shelby
Collins Johnson (WI) Thune
Corker Speier Thune
Cornyn Manchin Toney
Crapo McCain Vitter
Cruz McConnell Wicker
Enzi Moran

NAYS—56

Baldwin Cantwell Donnelly
Baucus Cardin Durbin
Becky Casey Feinstein
Bennet Casey Franken
BlumenthalCardin Graham
BoxerCoons Graham
BrownCowan Hagan

The amendment (No. 152) was rejected.

Mrs. DURBIN. 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 NO. 232, 295, 538, 62, AND 380

I ask unanimous consent that the following:

SEC. 3. 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 ACT

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 (Pub. L. 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. 232

(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 B of title IV, insert 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 restore the Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Agency Act of 2004 (P.L. 108–514) and the Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority Act of 2004 (P.L. 108–514), without raising revenue, by the Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Agency Act of 2004 (P.L. 108–514), 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 2013 through 2018 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2014 through 2025.

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:
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 addressing the nonprofit postal discount for State and national political committees and use such savings to reduce the deficit. The Chairman may also take 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.

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 related to the United States Postal Service.

The motion to lay on the table the table was agreed to.

The Chairman of the 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 related to the United States Postal Service addressing the nonprofit postal discount for State and national political committees and use such savings to reduce the deficit. The Chairman may also take 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.

The adjustment 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.

The Chairman may also take 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.

The adjustment 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.

The adjustment 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.

The adjustment 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.

The adjustment 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.

The adjustment 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.

The adjustment 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.

The adjustment 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.

The adjustment 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.

The adjustment 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.

The adjustment 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.

The adjustment 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.

The adjustment 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.

The adjustment 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.

The adjustment 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.

The adjustment 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.

The adjustment 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.

The adjustment 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.

The adjustment 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.

The adjustment 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.

The adjustment 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.

The adjustment 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.

The adjustment 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.

The adjustment 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.

The adjustment 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.
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.

Mr. WICKER. Division. Mr. President, 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. 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 tranches 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 on bloc.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Washington [Mrs. Murray] proposes amendments on 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. 1. 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 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 rescind 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 resulting from a 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 certified under paragraph 1(a)(1) of rule XLIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate—

(A) providing, authorizing, or recommending a spert 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 locality or Congressional district, other than through a statute or administrative formula-driven or competitive award process; or

(B) that

(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 of America 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 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 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 title III 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 promote 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 health and safety, and to provide that any savings will reduce the deficit)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 4. DEFICIT-REDUCTION RESERVE FUND FOR EMMINENT 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 in order to prevent or modify amendments (a) to limit or prevent the approval of reports that are related to broadening the effects of the sequester, including allowing Members of Congress to donate 20 percent of their salaries to charity or to 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 related levels in this resolution for 1 or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports that would 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. 153

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to promote exports)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 5. 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 1 or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports that would 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 ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment (No. 329) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 293

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment (No. 293) was agreed to.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I was 2 minutes equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 293, offered by the Senator from Arizona. Mr. FLAKE.

The amendment (No. 293) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 292

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is 2 minutes equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 292, offered by the Senator from South Carolina, Mr. GRAHAM.

The amendment (No. 292) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 289

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is 2 minutes equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 289, offered by the Senator from Nebraska, Mr. HELLER. Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, my amendment reinforces the important role of States having primary responsibility for wildlife and 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 amendment (No. 289) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 283

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment (No. 283) was withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 225

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment (No. 225) was withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 153

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is 2 minutes equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 153, offered by the Senator from Ohio. Mr. PORTMAN.

The amendment (No. 153) was withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 527

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is 2 minutes equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 527, offered by the Senator from Arkansas, Mr. BOOZMAN.

The amendment (No. 527) was agreed to.
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.

Ms. 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.

Ms. Ayotte. Mr. President, my amendment would establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to prohibit funding for the 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 chair has said the Army will not work. We have already appropriated $380 million in fiscal year 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 reconocita twice and that is not possible. The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. Murray. Mr. President, before we go to the rolloca 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 participants 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 of not every Senator had an opportunity to have an amendment. Many, many Senators have to say they were able to get their amendments. We have had amendments 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 the result that matters.

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—we 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 constructed 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 as possible. I have had several Members suggest that we might vote from our chairs and not leave the Chamber and cut these rolloca votes down to a much shorter period of time. Maybe we could discuss that. But I need time 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 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.
Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for further reading of the amendment be suspended. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CRAPo. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the amendment read as follows:

The amendment (No. 136) was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order, the majority has the next amendment.

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 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 PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. WARREN). 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.]
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 the amendment 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: Shahane No. 149, Blumenthal-Moran No. 577, Johnson No. 593, Manchin No. 316, Wyden No. 394, Baucus No. 395, Hassan 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. 494, Coats No. 195, Hoeven No. 213, Ayotte No. 161, Kirk No. 671, Murkowski No. 672, Rubio No. 195, Hoeven No. 269, Warner No. 263, Reid No. 141, Reid No. 318, Rockefeller No. 399, Baucus No. 267, Hagan No. 269, Reed No. 394, Baucus No. 477, Ayotte No. 29, Nelson No. 572, Landrieu No. 583, Menendez No. 584, Marcasse No. 605, Murray No. 606, Lautenberg No. 877, Tester No. 923, and agreed to en bloc: Shaheen No. 149, Blumenthal-Moran No. 577, Johnson No. 593, Manchin No. 316, Wyden No. 394, Baucus No. 395, Hassan 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. 494, Coats No. 195, Hoeven No. 213, Ayotte No. 161, Kirk No. 671, Murkowski No. 672, Rubio No. 195, Hoeven No. 269, Warner No. 263, Reid No. 141, Reid No. 318, Rockefeller No. 399, Baucus No. 267, Hagan No. 269, Reed No. 394, Baucus No. 477, Ayotte No. 29, Nelson No. 572, Landrieu No. 583, Menendez No. 584, Marcasse No. 605, Murray No. 606, Lautenberg No. 877, Tester No. 923, and agreed to en bloc: Shaheen No. 149, Blumenthal-Moran No. 577, Johnson No. 593, Manchin No. 316, Wyden No. 394, Baucus No. 395, Hassan 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. 494, Coats No. 195, Hoeven No. 213, Ayotte No. 161, Kirk No. 671, Murkowski No. 672, Rubio No. 195, Hoeven No. 269, Warner No. 263, Reid No. 141, Reid No. 318, Rockefeller No. 399, Baucus No. 267, Hagan No. 269, Reed No. 394, Baucus No. 477, Ayotte No. 29, Nelson No. 572, Landrieu No. 583, Menendez No. 584, Marcasse No. 605, Murray No. 606, Lautenberg No. 877, Tester No. 923, and agreed to en bloc: Shaheen No. 149, Blumenthal-Moran No. 577, Johnson No. 593, Manchin No. 316, Wyden No. 394, Baucus No. 395, Hassan 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. 494, Coats No. 195, Hoeven No. 213, Ayotte No. 161, Kirk No. 671, Murkowski No. 672, Rubio No. 195, Hoeven No. 269, Warner No. 263, 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. 119 (Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral re- serve 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. 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 relating to the challenge 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 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. 267 (Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral re- serve 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 relating to the challenge 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 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 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 fol- lowing:

SEC. 72. PROHIBITING THE USE OF GUARANTEE FEES AS AN OFFSET.

(a) PURPOSE.—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 resolu- tion and the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, this resolution, any previous resolution, and any subsequent budget resolution, provi- sions 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 legisla- tion.

AMENDMENT NO. 580 (Purpose: To provide for a deficit-neutral reserve fund in rural areas.)

On page 59, line 1, after “telecommuni- cations,” insert “including promoting in- vestments in broadband infrastructure to ex- pedite deployment of broadband to rural areas.”

AMENDMENT NO. 593 (Purpose: To provide for a deficit-neutral reserve fund on health care improvement)
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. 981
(Purpose: To exempt remote sales of business inputs)
On page 2, line 10, insert "and provided that such legislation may include require-
ments that State and local governments recognize the value of small businesses to the United States econ-
yomy by exempting the remote sales of business inputs from sales and use taxes" after "2025."

AMENDMENT NO. 365
(Purpose: To prohibit certain revisions of allo-
cations for workforce investment mea-
sures 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 adminis-
tration, reduce inefficient overlap, improve access, and enhance outcomes of Federal workforce development, youth and adult job training."

AMENDMENT NO. 394
(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral re-
serve 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 resolu-
tions, amendments, amendments between the House, conference reports relating to the Older Americans Act of 1965, which may include congregate and home-de-
levered 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. 418
(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral re-
serve fund relating to increasing funding for the inland waterways system)
At the end of title III, add the following:
SEC. 2. 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 resolu-
tions, amendments, amendments between the House, motions, or conference reports relating to funding the inland waterways system, by the amounts provided in such leg-
islation 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 posi-
hible costs to taxpayers of any budget sub-
mitted 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 sub-
mits its report to Congress relating to a budget submitted by the President for a fis-
cal year under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, such report shall contain—
(1) an estimate of the incremental costs for tax-
payers who will file individual income tax returns for taxable years ending during such fiscal year of any deficit that would result from—
(2) an analysis of the budgetary effects de-
scribed in paragraph (1).

AMENDMENT NO. 439
(Purpose: To provide additional resources to Criminal Investigations and Police Serv-
ces 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 fol-
lowing:

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, amendments between the House, motions, or conference reports relat-
ing to achieving full auditability of the fi-
nancial statements Department of Defense by 2017, without raising new revenues, 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 re-
serve fund relating to sanctions with re-
spect to Iran)
At the end of title III, add the following:
SEC. 332. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RE-
LATED 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 resolu-
tions, amendments, amendments between the House, conference reports relating to Iran, which may include efforts to clarify that the clearance and settlement of euro-denominated transactions through the financial institutions of the European Union financial institutions may not result in the evasion of or otherwise un-
dermine the impact of sanctions imposed with respect to Iran by the United States and the European Union including provi-
sions designed to strictly limit the access of the Government of Iran to its foreign ex-
change reserves and the facilitation of trans-
actions on behalf of sanctioned entities), by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legisla-
tion would not increase the deficit over ei-
ther 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. 265
(Purpose: To require fuller reporting on possible costs to taxpayers of any budget submitted by the President)
On page 28, between lines 11 and 12, insert the follow-

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 incremental costs for taxpayers who will file individual income tax returns for taxable years ending during such fiscal year of any deficit that would result from—
(2) an analysis of the budgetary effects described in paragraph (1).
SEC. 3. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO AUTHORIZE THE PHASE-IN 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 relating to the phase-in of any changes to individual or corporate tax systems.
March 22, 2013

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

AMENDMENT NO. 655
(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.)

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 1 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 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 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 ask the tally clerks, and that they be 7 1/2-minute 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 to get these amendments through, and I would vote for 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, 702, 673, 521, 414, 416, 709, 714, 710, AND 139, EN BLOC.

Mrs. MURRAY. I ask unanimous consent that the following amendments in order to be called up be the following: Barrassso 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. 710, Leahy No. 154, Leahy No. 710, a side-by-side to Senator INHOFE’s No. 139, and Inhofe No. 139; that there be no second-degrees amendments prior to votes in relation to any of those amendments; that none of the amendments be divisible; that notwithstanding all divisible, after 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 this resolution 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 West Virginia?

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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Object? The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objected. The clerk will report the amendments on bloc.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Washington [Mrs. Murray] proposes amendments en bloc: For Mr. Barrassso, 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. Postman, No. 154, for Mr. Leahy, No. 710, for Mr. Inhofe, No. 139.

The amendments are as follows:
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 15, 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 16, 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 20, line 14, reduce the amount by $1,000,000,000.
On page 20, line 15, increase the amount by $8,000,000,000.
On page 20, line 17, increase the amount by $8,000,000,000.
On page 20, line 19, increase the amount by $8,000,000,000.
On page 22, line 2, 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 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 21, 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.

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. 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. 782

(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. 3. 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, motions, 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:
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 an amendment to a concurrent resolution on the budget, 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 restricts 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 that is permitted under Federal law to 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 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 of the budget; or

(7) imposes prison sentences for sales, gifts, or other transfers of firearms to an individual who is known 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).

SEC. 4. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE PREVENTION OF NON-DEFENSE-RELATED SPENDING BY THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) Purpose.—To establish 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. 5. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO AID IN IMPLEMENTING THE PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES PROGRAM.

(a) Purpose.—To establish 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.

(b) Authorization.—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 related to closing certain tax expenditures, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not decrease 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.

SEC. 6. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO ENFORCE THE SENATE’S OBLIGATION TO MAINTAIN A DEFICIT-NEUTRAL BUDGET.

(a) Purpose.—To establish 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.

(b) Authorization.—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 related to closing certain tax expenditures, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not decrease 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.

SEC. 7. 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.

(a) Purpose.—To establish 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.

(b) Authorization.—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 related to closing certain tax expenditures, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not decrease 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.

SEC. 8. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO UPHOLD THE SENATE’S OBLIGATION TO MAINTAIN A DEFICIT-NEUTRAL BUDGET TO PREVENT THE UNITED STATES FROM ENTERING INTO THE UNITED NATIONS ARMS TRADE TREATY.

(a) Purpose.—To establish 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.

(b) Authorization.—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 related to closing certain tax expenditures, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not decrease 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 (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 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 outside of the United States; that is after they leave our shores.

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?

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, before we go to the yeas and nays, can I just say, in example of what is happening this 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 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

Alexander
Ayotte
Baldwin
Baucus
Begich
Benjamin
Blumenthal
Boozer
Boxer
Burr
Cantwell
Cardin
Carper
Casey
Chambliss
Collins
Cochrane
Coons
Corker
Cornyn
Cox
Durbin
Kaine

NAYS—72

Alexander
Ayotte
Baldwin
Baucus
Begich
Benjamin
Blumenthal
Boozer
Boxer
Burr
Cantwell
Cardin
Carper
Casey
Chambliss
Collins
Cochrane
Coons
Corker
Cornyn
Cox
Durbin
Kaine

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 an 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?

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, before we go to the yeas and nays, can I just say, in example of what is happening this 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 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. 83 Leg.]

YEAS—44

Alexander
Ayotte
Baldwin
Baucus
Begich
Benjamin
Blumenthal
Boxer
Burr
Cantwell
Cardin
Carper
Casey
Chambliss
Collins
Cochrane
Coons
Corker
Cornyn
Cox
Durbin
Kaine

NAYS—54

Alexander
Ayotte
Baldwin
Baucus
Begich
Benjamin
Blumenthal
Boxer
Burr
Cantwell
Cardin
Carper
Casey
Chambliss
Collins
Cochrane
Coons
Corker
Cornyn
Cox
Durbin
Kaine

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. 88 Leg.]

YEAS—54

Alexander
Ayotte
Baldwin
Baucus
Begich
Benjamin
Blumenthal
Boxer
Burr
Cantwell
Cardin
Carper
Casey
Chambliss
Collins
Cochrane
Coons
Corker
Cornyn
Cox
Durbin
Kaine

NAYS—54

Alexander
Ayotte
Baldwin
Baucus
Begich
Benjamin
Blumenthal
Boxer
Burr
Cantwell
Cardin
Carper
Casey
Chambliss
Collins
Cochrane
Coons
Corker
Cornyn
Cox
Durbin
Kaine

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 PCC 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. LATENBERG) 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

Alexander  Barrasso  Burr  Coburn  Collins  Crapo  Cruz  Enzi  Fischer  Roberts

NAYS—74

Alexander  Ayotte  Barrasso  Bennet  Blunt  Boozman  Burr  Chambless  Coats  Coats

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 secure 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. LATENBERG) 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—46

Alexander  Ayotte  Barrasso  Bennet  Blunt  Boozman  Burr  Chambless  Coats  Coats

NAYS—46

Alexander  Ayotte  Barrasso  Bennet  Blunt  Boozman  Burr  Chambless  Coats  Coats

The top of the page is cut off.
The amendment (No. 702) 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 Peng Jianmel 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 New Jersey.

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 force citizens to undergo involuntary abortion.

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.

The question is on agreeing to the 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 germane. The underlying resolution therefore violates section 305(b)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion. The legislative clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

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

The amendment (No. 702) was rejected.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote and to lay the amendment 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 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 909(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 PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

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

The amendment (No. 702) was rejected.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 673

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 at 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 collect 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.

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. 89 Leg.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAS</th>
<th>43</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Fischer</td>
<td>Moran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayotte Flake</td>
<td>Paul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burrage Grassley</td>
<td>Risch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boren Ratch</td>
<td>Roberts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burr Heller</td>
<td>Rubio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chambliss Hoeven</td>
<td>Scott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coats Inhofe</td>
<td>Sessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coburn Isakson</td>
<td>Shelby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cochran Johnson (WI)</td>
<td>Thune</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corker Johnson</td>
<td>Toomey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crapo Lee</td>
<td>Vitter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruz McCain</td>
<td>Wicker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enzi McConnell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baldwin Kaine</td>
<td>Murray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baucus Harkin</td>
<td>Nelson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begich Heinrich</td>
<td>Pryor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bent Hankamp</td>
<td>Reed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blumenthal Hiron</td>
<td>Sanders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown Johnson (ID)</td>
<td>Rockefeller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantwell Kiner</td>
<td>Schatz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardin Klobuchar</td>
<td>Schamier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carper Landriejn</td>
<td>Shabeen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casey Leahy</td>
<td>Stabenow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collins Levin</td>
<td>Tester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coons Manchin</td>
<td>Udall (CO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowan McCaskill</td>
<td>Udall (NM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donnelly Menendez</td>
<td>Warner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durbin Mcknight</td>
<td>Warren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feinstein Mikulski</td>
<td>Whitehouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franken Murkowski</td>
<td>Wyden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilibrand Murphy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 Dukhne, Andrew Breenen, Stewart Maxfield, Brittany Robertson, and Katie Robinson.

(Appraisl, Senators rising.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. 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, 3 1⁄2 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 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.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAS</th>
<th>62</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Cober</td>
<td>Grassley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayotte Cochran</td>
<td>Hagans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrasso Collins</td>
<td>Hatch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baucus Corkeeper</td>
<td>Heller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begich Cornyn</td>
<td>Hoeven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett Crapo</td>
<td>Inhofe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blunt Crun</td>
<td>Isakson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boozman Donnelly</td>
<td>Johanns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boxer Endicott</td>
<td>Kaine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chambliss Flake</td>
<td>King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coats Griffith</td>
<td>Kirk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotter Harkin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durbin Johnson (WI)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 second?

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, this amendment requires something called dynamic scoring. The Joint Committee on Tax, which provides us with information on how to score 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a second?

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 amendment was announced—yeas 51, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 90 Leg.]

YEAS—51

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a second?

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, this amendment requires something called dynamic scoring. The Joint Committee on Tax, which provides us with information on how to score 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a second?

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 amendment was announced—yeas 51, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 90 Leg.]
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  Paul
Beigun  Grassley  Paul
Barrasso  Graham  Paul
Barrasso  Graham  Paul
Burr  Heinrich  Risch
Chambliss  Heitkamp  Risch
Coates  Heller  Risch
Coburn  Hoeven  Roberts
Cochran  Inhofe  Scott
Collins  Johnson (WI)  Tester
Corker  Johnson (WI)  Tester
Cruz  Lee  Tester
Donnelly  Menchin  Vitter
Enzi  McCain  Vitter

NAYS—46

Baldwin  Harkin  Reed
Baucus  Hirono  Reid
Bennet  Johnson (SD)  Rockefeller
Blumenthal  Kaine  Sanders
Boxer  King  Schatz
Brown  Klobuchar  Schumacher
Cantwell  Landrieu  Shaheen
Cardin  Leahy  Shaheen
Carpenter  Levin  Shelby
Casey  McCaskill  Shanken
Coons  Menendez  Tester
Cowan  McCollum  Udall (CO)
Durbin  Mikulski  Udall (NM)
Feinstein  Murphy  Udall (NM)
Franken  Murray  Udall (NM)
Gillibrand  Nelson  Udall (NM)

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-ama 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 order.

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 opportuinity 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 PRESIDENT pro tempore. 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

Alexander  Enzi  Moran
Ayotte  Fischer  Moran
Barrasso  Flake  Paul
Baucus  Graham  Paul
Beigun  Grassley  Paul
Barrasso  Graham  Paul
Burr  Heinrich  Risch
Chambliss  Heitkamp  Risch
Coates  Heller  Risch
Coburn  Hoeven  Roberts
Cochran  Inhofe  Scott
Collins  Johnson (WI)  Tester
Corker  Johnson (WI)  Tester
Cruz  Lee  Tester
Donnelly  Menchin  Vitter
Enzi  McCain  Vitter
Franken  Murray  Vitter
Gillibrand  Nelson  Vitter

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 PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. 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 due 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 a bare. 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 want to 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, Carl Kelly, Joseph McCormack, Greg McNell, 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 made available $8 billion 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. As of December last year, 6,400 Vermonters with Medicare received a 50-percent discount on their covered brand-name prescriptions, resulting in an average savings of $755 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: 26th birthdays. The improvements we are seeing in Vermont go on and on: in 2011 and 2012, 71 million Americans and 26th birthdays. The improvements we are seeing in Vermont go on and on: in 2011 and 2012, 71 million Americans and millions more Americans gain access to and receive 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 and 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 pre-existing 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, 15 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 an additional $5,480,000 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 or at the gas pump, 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 Vermont family 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 country, and 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 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