a bipartisan bill—House leaders took the unprecedented step earlier this year and split food assistance from the other essential programs supported by the farm bill, even though we passed a farm bill that would save $25 to $30 billion.

After months of delay, last week the House voted on a separate nutrition title, which only moves us further away from enacting a farm bill before the programs expire on September 30. This latest lurching maneuver means even more uncertainty for farmers.

Instead of standing with the millions of Americans who are still struggling to put food on the table—these House Members never have to go hungry, except by choice, because of the huge salaries they make—it is regrettable and inexcusable that the House Republicans are turning to slashing essential nutrition help for struggling Americans. Ensuring that these programs can continue to serve Vermonters and all Americans is a key part of enacting a strong farm bill for our country. It is a reality recognized by the bipartisan Senate-passed farm bill. The House cuts SNAP benefits by levels 10 times as high as the bipartisan Senate bill and twice as high as the House’s original bill. These cuts would mean that each year an average of 3 million people would be kicked off food assistance, even those who are working and making as little as $2,500 per year. What’s worse, the bill will mean hundreds of thousands of children will lose access to school meals Ask any teacher, whether in Hawaii, Vermont or in any other State, does a hungry child learn? Of course not.

These school meals are an investment in our future and an investment in our children. Having young people who are able to learn is an investment in the future of the U.S. economy. So what do we say? Oh, no, we are not going to feed them. This is a country that spends billions of dollars just to get rid of excess food and on needless diet programs, but we cannot feed children in school. It is shameful. It is mean-spirited, shortsighted, and it hurts America.

If that were not enough, the House Republicans also assert with their bill that 3 months of benefits every 3 years will mean hundreds of thousands of children will lose access to school meals. Ask any teacher, whether in Hawaii, Vermont or in any other State, does a hungry child learn? Of course not.
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If that were not enough, the House Republicans also assert with their bill that 3 months of benefits every 3 years will mean hundreds of thousands of children will lose access to school meals. Ask any teacher, whether in Hawaii, Vermont or in any other State, does a hungry child learn? Of course not.

These school meals are an investment in our future and an investment in our children. Having young people who are able to learn is an investment in the future of the U.S. economy. So what do we say? Oh, no, we are not going to feed them. This is a country that spends billions of dollars just to get rid of excess food and on needless diet programs, but we cannot feed children in school. It is shameful. It is mean-spirited, shortsighted, and it hurts America.

If that were not enough, the House Republicans also assert with their bill that 3 months of benefits every 3 years will mean hundreds of thousands of children will lose access to school meals. Ask any teacher, whether in Hawaii, Vermont or in any other State, does a hungry child learn? Of course not.

These school meals are an investment in our future and an investment in our children. Having young people who are able to learn is an investment in the future of the U.S. economy. So what do we say? Oh, no, we are not going to feed them. This is a country that spends billions of dollars just to get rid of excess food and on needless diet programs, but we cannot feed children in school. It is shameful. It is mean-spirited, shortsighted, and it hurts America.
The CR that was sent over to us is loaded with political ideology. What does it do? First it wants to defund the President’s Affordable Care Act and take health care away from those who need it. It also is designed to create a crisis over the debt ceiling and undermine the full faith and credit of the United States. Our President has been clear that he will veto any bill with these toxic political riders. He is right, and what he says counts.

Much will be said in the media over the next several days about something called the continuing resolution. Well, here we go again using Washington-speak that nobody in America understands with budgetary and fiscal matters. It is also designed to keep the U.S. Government open and functioning while we work out our difficulties.

So that is what a continuing resolution or CR means. It was never meant to be a vehicle for controversial, provocative, poke-it-in-your-eye and stick-it-to-you controversial legislation. It was never meant to be a negotiating chip for a grander bargain to resolve issues, nor was it ever designed to be a weapon in the fight over the size and role of government. That is for the authorizing committee. That is what we do in our appropriations committees at the subcommittee level. That is what Senator MURRAY in her Budget Committee has done when we marked up the budget. That is where those fights come in, not at the end of the fiscal year.

Here we have the same old tricks and techniques that we have seen year after year since President Obama was elected. They not only want to throw sand into the gears of the functioning of government, they want to throw cement into the Senate floor to make us powerless to function. If they want to project American power, they should be willing to show that the greatest parliamentary, deliberative, and constitutional body in the world is capable of clear and strong leadership.

The President has said he will veto it, so the riders are veto bait. This is all designed to use a lot of time and a lot of resources to get to a stopgap, to a place where a Democrat in the Senate is a legislator, not a prop for a political farce. This is not Gilbert and Sullivan, this is the real deal.

The American people are fed up with these manufactured crises and, so am I. We want to get on with what we want to go. And who is the “we”? I believe it is not only the Democrats in the Senate, but I believe there are pragmatists on both sides of the aisle who want to find a sensible center where we can achieve fiscal stability, begin to draw down our public debt but also have an opportunity to be progrowth in our country, where we focus on important issues of national security, rebuilding America with infrastructures in terms of our educational system and also our research and development, coming up with the new ideas that will lead to the new jobs in the new century. The way we want to do this and the way I am suggesting is the way the American people would like us to vote.

The other party would like us to have a continuing resolution until December 15. That is one more gimmick to bring us to Christmas Eve, where we will have a lot of theatrics and jingle bells-jingle bells while we try to solve our situation.

I want a short-term CR. I would like one between now and November 15—not long term, not something just to silly and dither. I am tired of silly and dither. So I suggest a short-term CR for sometime around mid-November. The purpose of that would be that we would want to get to a vote in December that would be on the funding of all of our bills, arrived at by a vote here, a conference committee with the House, where our spending would be sensible, it would be affordable, it would meet compelling human needs, the national security issues of the United States, and would rebuild our infrastructure.

This isn’t hard, but in order to get that, we need to clear out the toxic political items in the CR. So I want a clean CR. A clean CR means getting rid of the political riders of defunding ObamaCare and striking the debt limit riders.

Second, we need to have a shorter date. My recommendation would be around November 15 because the longer term CR means more autopilot functioning of government—in other words, more government dysfunction. November 15 keeps the pressure on both sides of the aisle to get the job done.

What is getting the job done? First of all, we would like to cancel sequester, and we would like to cancel sequester in a balanced way. What is sequester? We have to come up with about $1 trillion in debt reduction. We can do that through additional strategic cuts. As an appropriator, I am willing to look at them. Secondly, revenue. What about those loopholes Mitt Romney about? Let’s block those loopholes back and examine them. Let’s look at some of the items in mandatory spending. This is the way we can enact our bills, invest in and protect our country.

Our Nation faces long-term fiscal challenges. It does not come out of the Congress. But the place for those negotiations is not in a continuing resolution. It belongs in the Budget Committee. And the six Republican Senators who are planning to filibuster the budget are those who threatened and blocked the budget the Senate passed going to conference in the House. So they blocked the budget. Then they blame us because we don’t have a budget. Go figure.

The House and Senate Appropriations Committees, the appropriators, have marked up annual funding bills. We are ready to make sure we can do our work, but we need the Budget Committee to give us a top line. We can’t get to conference because Republicans have objected. Now they want to have a simple stopgap that leads to a showdown and a shutdown.

If we don’t come together, we will have very serious consequences. If we do not enact a clean continuing resolution by October 1 that enables us to get to a sensible outcome in early December, the government will shut down. Doesn’t that look great for the United States of America. We say to emerging democracies all over the world, Look at us.

We need to show we can govern. It has not only consequences in the way we are viewed in the world; it provides uncertainty for business, it will be terrible for our economy, and it will have a direct impact on jobs. Business will not know what the government is going to do and so they don’t know what they can do, so they will not be spending to create jobs. All we are doing is creating more chaos.

We want to be sure that the Small Business Administration approves loans—they need to be open to do that—that rural housing development and farm
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, it is my understanding that under unanimous consent the Senator from Texas is to be recognized, but I ask if he would allow me 5 minutes to follow the Senator from Maryland and then yield the floor to him.

I thank the Senator from Texas. Madam President, I yield the floor to the Appropriations Committee. We have served together in the House, now in the Senate. I am happy to serve with her in the capacity as chairwoman of the Appropriations Subcommittee, the largest in dollar amount that has this responsibility.

I think what she has spelled out on the floor is very straightforward and very honest. We were challenged in the Senate to come up with a budget resolution this year. Many of our critics said, You have come up with excuses; now come up with a budget resolution. And we did. Six months ago, a budget resolution, and then we asked for consent to go to a conference committee with the House to work out our differences. Time and time again Senators on the other side of the aisle objected to our meeting with the House to work out our differences. They had a different reason every day. The net result was we couldn't have the conference committee to reach an agreement with the House on how much we would spend.

Then Senator MURRAY brought to us in our appropriations subcommittees: Do your work. Sit down with your Republican member and come up with a spending bill for next year that gets rid of sequestration and that is sensible. And we did. Time and again we worked these out on a bipartisan basis, brought them through committee, ready for floor action. The first bill came to the floor, true pastaste, Senator PATTY MURRAY brought it to the floor. We wanted to bring this first spending bill to the floor. Let's debate it, let's get it done. The Republicans objected to the spending bill, and they objected to the House, the Senate coming together and working out our differences. They had a different reason every day. The net result was we couldn't have the conference committee to reach an agreement with the House on how much we would spend.

I thank the Senator from Texas. Senator MURRAY brought to us in our appropriations subcommittees: Do your work. Sit down with your Republican member and come up with a spending bill for next year that gets rid of sequestration and that is sensible. And we did. Time and again we worked these out on a bipartisan basis, brought them through committee, ready for floor action. The first bill came to the floor, true pastaste, Senator PATTY MURRAY brought it to the floor. We wanted to bring this first spending bill to the floor. Let's debate it, let's get it done. The Republicans objected to the spending bill, and they objected to the House, the Senate coming together and working out our differences. They had a different reason every day. The net result was we couldn't have the conference committee to reach an agreement with the House on how much we would spend.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, I rise today in opposition to ObamaCare. I rise today in an effort to speak for 26 million Texans and for 300 million Americans.

All across this country Americans are suffering because of ObamaCare. ObamaCare isn't working. Yet fundamentally there are politicians in this body who are not listening to the people. They are not listening to the concern of their constituents, they are not listening to the people forced into part-time work, to the people losing their health insurance, to the people who are struggling.

A great many Texans, a great many Americans feel they don't have a voice. I hope to play some very small part in helping provide that voice for them. I intend to speak in opposition to ObamaCare. I intend to speak in support of defending ObamaCare, until I am no longer able to stand, to do everything I can to help Americans stand together and recognize this grand experiment 3½ years ago is, quite simply, not working.

I also say at the outset that I am proudly honored to be standing side by side with my friend and colleague Senator MIKE LEE from Utah. Senator LEE has shown visionary leadership in standing and taking the mantle of leading the effort to defund ObamaCare and to challenge this train wreck of a law, and Senator LEE has been repaid at times with vilification from official Washington.
In my judgment there is no Senator in this body, Republican or Democrat, who is more principled, who is more dedicated, who is more fearless and willing to fight for the principles that make this Nation great than is Senator MIKES LEE. It is a singular privilege to serve with, to stand by side with him and so many others in this body, and, even more importantly, so many millions of Americans all across this country.

The problem in Washington, and the problem is bigger than a continuing resolution. It is bigger than ObamaCare. It is even bigger than the budget. The most fundamental problem and the frustration is that the men and women in Washington aren’t listening. If you talk to the man and woman on the street, that is the message you hear over and over again: Why don’t they listen to me? Why don’t they hear what we have to say? They aren’t listening to the millions of people, Democrats, Independents, Republicans, who are out there in the community. The most fundamental problem with the low approval ratings that Congress has. It varies—sometimes, 10, 12, 14 percent—but it is always abysmal.

Some suggested the reason was that we are not legislating enough. We just need to pass some more laws and the American people will be happy. I have to admit, that does not comport with just about anything I have ever heard in the State of Texas. That doesn’t comport with anything I have ever heard from constituents. I am going to suggest the most fundamental reason Congress remains in the low teens in approval ratings is because Congress is not listening to the American people.

I have been here for a long time to believe Washington knows better; to believe that all the solutions are for the men and women of America and keep up with business as usual. People wonder why Congress has such low approval ratings. I remember when all 100 of us were in the historic Senate Chamber for a bipartisan meeting. Multiple Senators expressed frustration and confusion. The frustration is with the low approval ratings that Congress has. It varies—sometimes, 10, 12, 14 percent—but it is always abysmal.

Some suggested the reason was that we are not legislating enough. We just need to pass some more laws and the American people will be happy. I have to admit, that does not comport with just about anything I have ever heard in the State of Texas. That doesn’t comport with anything I have ever heard from constituents. I am going to suggest the most fundamental reason Congress remains in the low teens in approval ratings is because Congress is not listening to the American people.

ObamaCare is the biggest job killer in this country. The American people want to stop this madness, and so do I. In Washington, we pass million-dollar bills, billion-dollar bills no one has ever read, often without even voting on them. We call it unanimous consent. It is only unanimous because they don’t let anyone know.

In Washington, we spend $2 trillion more than last year and then tell voters we saved money. The system is deliberately designed to hide what we are actually doing.

In this debate right now over ObamaCare and the continuing resolution, voting to pass bills is called procedure, as if it doesn’t matter. We pretend it doesn’t matter. It does matter. Our leaders right now demand approval for bills before they are amended: Everyone come to the floor, vote for the bills, then we will amend it to make it say the opposite of what it says right now, but you have already voted so don’t worry about it. We are told to agree to the bills without even knowing what the final product will be and that is what is happening right now. Our leaders in both parties are asking us to support a bill, to cut off debate on a bill without even knowing what is in it.

It is as the former Speaker of the House NANCY PELOSI once observed: Pass it to find out what is in it. That is how Washington does business.

Let me tell you how this is likely to unfold. Senate majority leader HARRY...
We are not supposed to speak for the people. There is a way things are done in Washington and make no mistake, DC depends upon Americans not paying attention.

They know most Americans are quite reasonable working hard to provide for their family. They are too busy spending time with their friends and family. They are too busy working to try to make sure their family is provided for. They are going to church. They are dealing with the day-to-day blahs of the average American. What have they learned? The American people have learned when we get involved, even then it seems as though Washington politicians rarely listen.

I believe that can change. I am standing here today to salute, to celebrate the American democratic system. I am standing here today to suggest that if Senators listen to their constituents, if we listen to the American people, the vote would be 100 to 0 to defund ObamaCare. Even those Senators who voted for it might have believed it would work. Many of us would have disagreed. Had I been here, not surprisingly, I would have voted against ObamaCare 3½ years ago. A number of us, in this body voted in favor of it. Regardless of how Members voted 3½ years ago, one of the great virtues of life is learning, looking at the evidence, looking at the facts, and seeing when something is not working.

Look at the labor unions. Three-and-a-half years ago the labor unions were enthusiastically supporting ObamaCare. Why? Because they heard the promises. They heard it was going to work, and that it would be a bo- nanza for all. They believed the promises, and that is understandable. Yet one of the things we have seen this year is one labor union after another after another saying: Whoa. This thing isn’t working. This thing is hurting us. This thing is hurting our Members.

James Huff, the president of the Teamsters, has said ObamaCare is destroying the 40-hour workweek. It is destroying the backbone of the American middle class. That is not me saying that, that is not any politician from Washington saying that, that is the Teamsters.

We should submit the question to the American people: Do the American people want to destroy the 40-hour workweek that is the backbone of the American middle class? That is not a close question. People talk about how we are a 50-50 Nation and how there is a tight partisan divide. I don’t believe it. I think on questions such as that there is an overwhelming majority of Americans who say that is not destroy the 40-hour workweek. Of course we shouldn’t break the backbone of the American middle class.
If more politicians listened to the people, we would respond and avert this train wreck. Yet the politicians of Washington tell us: Don’t worry about it. ObamaCare is going to be peachy keen. The Senate is too busy to do anything. Republicans have never been people who accept failure. Americans have never been people who accept impossibility. If we look to a ragtag bunch of colonists in the 18th century, the idea that we would stand up to Great Britain, the British Army—the most mighty military force on the face of the planet—was impossible. It can’t be done. I guarantee that all of the pun- dits we see going on TV and intoning in deep baritone voices: This cannot be done. We can’t do it. This will take the British Army. It can’t be done. It is impos- sible. We have never been intimidated. As you were taxation without representation. Accept that this is impossible.

If we fast forward to the Civil War—a time of enormous pain, anguish, and bloodshed in the United States—there were a lot of voices then who said the Union cannot be saved. It cannot be done. Accept defeat. I suspect those same pundits, had they been around in the mid-19th century, would have written messages in dark ink and sending it by carrier pigeon, saying: This cannot be done. You can’t stand up to the British Army. It can’t be done. It is impos- sible. We have never been intimidated. Accept that this is impossible.

If we go to the 1940s, Nazi Germany—look, we saw it in Britain. Neville Chamberlain told the British people: Accept the Nazis. Yes, they will domi- nate the continent of Europe, but that is not inevitable. Let’s appease them. Why? Because it can’t be done. We can’t possibly stand against them.

In America there were voices who lis- tened to that; I suspect the same pun- dits who said it couldn’t be done. If this had happened in the 1940s, we would have been listening to them. Even then they would have made tele- vision. They would have gotten beyond the carrier pigeons and letters and they would have been on TV saying: You cannot defeat the Germans.

If we go to the late 1960s when a President, John F. Kennedy, told this country: We are going to send a man to the Moon—when John F. Kennedy told this country we are going to send a man to the Moon—there were a lot of people who said he couldn’t do it. It is impossible. It cannot be done. Yet John F. Kennedy had the vision to say Americans can do things—whatever we set our minds to.

If we go to the late 1970s and 1980s, we were in the midst of the Cold War. I re- member growing up in the Cold War. I remember being told the Soviet Union cannot be defeated. It cannot be done. We have to accept malaise. We have to accept second-class citizenship. They have a lot of weapons. We cannot pos- sibly stand up to the Soviet Union.

There was a President—a President whom I admired deeply, President Ron-ald Reagan, answering the question: What is your strategy on the Cold War? Answer: We win, they lose.

At the same time those same Washington fountains of wisdom said: It can’t be done. No, no, no, we can’t win. Winning is a two-dimensional strategy. We need to be much more nuanced than that. We need to push for detente, whatever that means. We need to push for something short of actually winning.

So we get to ObamaCare, and what do all of those voices say? It cannot be stopped. It can’t be done. We cannot defund it. By any measure ObamaCare is a far less intimidating foe than those I have discussed, with the possible ex- ception of the Moon. The Moon might be as intimidating as ObamaCare. Yet notice the same thing that we gave to the same message that they have said over and over and over again, which is the opposite of the message of the lit- tle engine that could: No, you can’t. It can’t be done. No, we can’t.

What should we do instead of you know what? We hear echoes from the past battles. We ought to have a vote where we can go to our constituents and say: By golly, we really, really, really dislike ObamaCare. Can we add a couple of extra amendments to make it clear that it is really, really, really.

We wonder why our constituents look at us and say: What on Earth are you doing? Do you actually care that we are losing our jobs? Do you actually care that our small businesses are not growing? Do you care that health insur- ance premiums for people who are struggling are skyrocketing? Do you care that more and more Americans are losing their health insurance? We don’t need fake fights. We don’t need fake votes. We need real change.

We need a better economy. We need more jobs. We need more freedom. And what is critical in doing that is stop- ping ObamaCare because Americans should not have to worry about what Washing- ton is doing to them, what Washington is doing is making their life harder. It is not any less that Washington is doing to jeopardize the health insur- ance they have now.

I cannot tell the President how many times across the State of Texas I have had men and women come up to me with severe disabilities and some in wheelchairs—and say: Please, stop this bill. Stop ObamaCare because I don’t want to lose my health insur- ance. It is jeopardizing the health in- surance coverage I have now.

We all remember when President Obama told the American people: If you like your health insurance, you can keep it. Now at the time that sounded good. Any of us who liked our health insurance wanted to keep it. We liked that promise. That is the kind of promise we like from our candidates and our officeholders. Yet as I mentioned earlier, one of the great virtues of being in Washington is the ability to learn—the ability to learn from evidence and facts. We have learned that promise did not, in fact, meet reality because the reality is mil- lions of Americans are at risk of losing their health insurance.

A few weeks ago UPS sent a letter to 15,000 employees and it said: We are terminating spousal health insurance because of ObamaCare. Their husbands and wives were told: Sorry, your health insurance is gone. Remember, the promise was: If you like your health in- surance, you can keep it. For those 15,000 UPS employees—for their hus- bands and wives—that promise has been disproved by reality. This body would step up and stop ObamaCare if we could rationally do that for our constituents. So together that is what we have to do: Make DC listen.

A lot of folks in Washington are angry—lot of folks in Washington are angry— and our officeholders. You can’t stand up to the British Army. It can’t be done. It is impos- sible. We have never been intimidated. Accept that this is impossible.

If we fast forward to the Civil War—a time of enormous pain, anguish, and bloodshed in the United States—there were a lot of voices then who said the Union cannot be saved. It cannot be done. Accept defeat. I suspect those same pundits, had they been around in the mid-19th century, would have written messages in dark ink and sending it by carrier pigeon, saying: This cannot be done. You can’t stand up to the British Army. It can’t be done. It is impos- sible. We have never been intimidated. Accept that this is impossible.

If we go to the 1940s, Nazi Germany—look, we saw it in Britain. Neville Chamberlain told the British people: Accept the Nazis. Yes, they will domi- nate the continent of Europe, but that is not inevitable. Let’s appease them. Why? Because it can’t be done. We can’t possibly stand against them.

In America there were voices who lis- tened to that; I suspect the same pun- dits who said it couldn’t be done. If this had happened in the 1940s, we would have been listening to them. Even then they would have made tele- vision. They would have gotten beyond the carrier pigeons and letters and they would have been on TV saying: You cannot defeat the Germans.

If we go to the late 1960s when a President, John F. Kennedy, told this country: We are going to send a man to the Moon—when John F. Kennedy told this country we are going to send a man to the Moon—there were a lot of people who said he couldn’t do it. It is impossible. It cannot be done. Yet John F. Kennedy had the vision to say Americans can do things—whatever we set our minds to.

If we go to the late 1970s and 1980s, we were in the midst of the Cold War. I re- member growing up in the Cold War. I remember being told the Soviet Union cannot be defeated. It cannot be done.
What if I lose my health insurance because I said: Ma'am, I don't know the priorities better than you do. I will confess that I felt embarrassed because I said: Boss, I am too busy. Boss, I don't want to listen. You may have some priorities for the business but not me. I know better than you.

None of us did that. Because in the private sector, there is a quick and immediate response. If you tell your boss in the private sector: Hey, boss, my time is too important for you, I don't care about your priorities; I am not going to listen to you, I suspect that will be your last day at that place of employment.

Why is Washington broken? Because I said: Boss, I am too busy. Boss, I don't want to listen. You may have some priorities for the business but not me. I know better than you.

None of us did that. Because in the private sector, there is a quick and immediate response. If you tell your boss: Hey, boss, my time is too important for you, I don't care about your priorities; I am not going to listen to you, I suspect that will be your last day at that place of employment.

What is Washington broken? Because I said: Boss, I am too busy. Boss, I don't want to listen. You may have some priorities for the business but not me. I know better than you.

Don't even bother to call my office because it just ties up my staff. It is always a priority to do something you do. I know the priorities better than you do.

What a broken system. What a broken system. We work for the people. Why are the people unhappy with Washington? Why are they disgusted with Washington? Because Washington is not listening to them. There is a game that is focused on maintaining the status quo. Staying in office—that is what is important because if the instant he or she shows up on the payroll, boom, the entire business is subject to 20,000 pages of regulations and crushing costs.

None of us did that. Because in the private sector, there is a quick and immediate response. If you tell your boss: Hey, boss, my time is too important for you, I don't care about your priorities; I am not going to listen to you, I suspect that will be your last day at that place of employment.

Why is Washington broken? Because Washington is not listening to them. There is a game that is focused on maintaining the status quo. Staying in office—that is what is important because if the instant he or she shows up on the payroll, boom, the entire business is subject to 20,000 pages of regulations and crushing costs.
of the people looking for work are unable to find it. I am going to suggest that people giving up is even worse. What a sad testament, given the American spirit, the American spirit that we can do anything if we put our minds to it, that everyone—the great blessings of this Nation have been fundamentally that it does not matter who you are, it does not matter who your daddy was, it does not matter whether you were born into great economic privilege or whether you were born into humble means, anyone in this country can achieve anything based on hard work, perseverance, and based on the content of your character. What a tremendous, unique blessing that is in the United States of America. The reason this ObamaCare fight matters so much is that is imperiled right now. In order for anyone with nothing to achieve anything, they have to be able to get a job to start. They have to get on to the first rung of their deals. They have a chance of getting to the second or the third or the fourth or the fifth. Just a week ago the Wall Street Journal had a long article about the “lost generation,” about young people coming to work in the last few years who have not gotten their first job or who have gotten a part-time job. Because of ObamaCare, their employer does not want to hire them for 40 hours a week, so they get hired for 29 hours a week.

Think about young people. If they do not get that first job, they are not going to get the second, they are not going to get the third. The impact for young people right now that ObamaCare is having is absolutely devastating. What this Wall Street Journal article was saying is that the economic data shows that impact will be with them their entire lives; that when they start off their career not gaining skills at启动, not climbing the economic ladder, that delay will stick with them forever.

What a travesty that young people are being denied a fair shot at the American dream because of what we have wrought because of ObamaCare. That should unite all of us. If we were listening to the American people, that would be where our attention would lie.

Fundamentally, what this week is about is that we need to make DC listen, make them listen to the single mom working at a diner, struggling to feed her kids, who has just been told she is being reduced to 29 hours a week. Who is speaking for that single mom right now? Who is talking about how ObamaCare is forcing more and more people into part-time employment? And, by the way, she does not get health insurance. Instead, she is forced to sacrifice what she needs most to keep going down. She is forced to sacrifice what she needs to keep going down.

This fight is not about any Member of this body. This fight is not about personality. Look, most Americans could not give a flying flip about a bunch of politicians in Washington. Who cares? You know, almost all of us are a little bit too busy with our own haircuts, what have we been talking about?

The American people care about is giving their kids a better future.

What the American people care about is having a job with a future, not a job where they are working 29 hours a week, where they are punching a clock, where they feel as though they are just going through the motions, but a job where they say: Hey, I have a career. I have a future. I have a chance to care for my family. That is what the American people care about.

So regardless of the rocks that will be thrown—and they will continue to be thrown—I have been engaged in that game, no intention of speaking ill of any Senator, Republican or Democratic, because it is not about us. Anyone who is trying to make this a battle of personalities is trying to change the topic from the topic that should matter: whether ObamaCare is helping the American people.

If we focus on the substance, the evidence is overwhelming. This law is a train wreck. Every day the headlines come in: more jobs lost, more people seeing their health premiums going up, more people pushed into part-time work. Yet every day the Senate goes about its business and says: We are too busy to listen to the American people.

Different games, to be sure, that go on on both sides of the aisle. Many of our friends on the Democratic side of the aisle right now endeavor to convince the American people: Pay no attention to your lying eyes; ObamaCare is real, too! That is not going terribly well. But on the Republican side of the aisle, there is a lot of energy and attention focused on saying: Well, yes, ObamaCare is terrible, but under no circumstances could we ever do anything about it. That is beyond us. We are destined to lose. So what we are interested in on the Republican side of the aisle is let’s cast a vote two, 3, 10—as many votes as possible to say: ObamaCare is really bad. We cannot fix it.

You know, that problem—it crosses that middle line. Whether you are telling your constituents it is really working out well despite the objective facts to the contrary or whether you are telling your constituents: I agree, it is a terrible thing, but I cannot do anything to fix it, in both cases you are not listening to the people. That is something we need to correct. All of us, all 100 of us—we need to listen to the American people. We need to do something about the American people and DC listen. If we do not, the frustration will grow. If we do not, the disillusions will with Washington will grow. If we do not, the approval rating of Congress will keep going down, keep going down, keep going down. The only way to fix this problem is to demonstrate that we understand—we understand the fact that we are not driven by partisan ideology; that we are driven by doing our jobs and listening to the American people.

It is my fervent hope that over the course of this week, over the course of this debate, that all 46 Senators on the Republican side will unite and that
more and more Democrats will come together and say: Listen, we have an obligation to our constituents. That is an obligation we are going to honor.

Mr. LEE. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CRUZ. I am happy to yield for a question without yielding the floor.

Mr. LEE. I would ask my distin-
guished colleague, the Senator from Texas, a series of questions with regard to this concept to make DC listen. It is interesting that we are having this dis-
cussion right now at a time in our his-
tory when never has it been easier for so many people throughout the coun-
try to have so few resources to be heard by so many.

In the past, you had to own a newspa-
paper or perhaps in more recent years you had to own a radio station or a televi-
sion company or something like that so basic it be heard by a lot of people. But these days pretty much anyone can gain access to a telephone or the Internet, they can send an e-mail, they can submit a post. It is one of the things that have made possible a groundswell of people—just a few minutes ago the Senator mentioned 1.6 million Amer-
icans just in the last few weeks signing a petition asking for Congress to make a decision to protect the American people from the harmful effects of ObamaCare.

They want government funded, just as we want government funded. They want government to be able to con-
tinue to do the things government does. They want people to be able to rely on government to protect them, to protect our borders, to protect our so-
vereignty, protect our homeland against those who would harm us. They want government to be able to carry out its basic functions and its responsibility. They want their government funded. But they do not want that held hostage by something else. They do not want that funding tied to the funding of ObamaCare. They do want that funding tied to the government, kept government funded but they want us to defund ObamaCare.

The House of Representatives shows that at least that side of DC, that side of the Capitol was listening. I applaud the Speaker of the House and the other leaders in the House of Representatives who did that. That suggests to me that they were listening on that side of the Capitol. They had many millions of Americans calling out on the tele-
phone, through mail, e-mail, every con-
ceivable medium for relief from this bill. They listened. They listened be-
cause they understand that the Amer-
ican people are being hurt by this. They ask the same questions the Sen-
ator (the Texan) and I and others have asked: How many more Americans will have to lose their jobs because of ObamaCare before Congress acts? How many more Americans will have to lose their wages or their hours cut as a re-

compensation for that ill-conceived law they do something about this? How many more people will have to lose access to health coverage before Congress does something?

Just last Friday we saw Home Depot—one of America’s great compa-
nies, one of America’s great success stories, one of America’s great employ-
ers—announce that 20,000 employees will be losing their health coverage. How will we have to hear before Congress does something to protect Americans from the harmful effects of this law—a law that was passed a few years ago without a single Republican vote in the House of Representatives; a law that was passed a few years ago without a single Republican vote in the Senate; a law that was passed—all 2,700 pages as it was then constituted—without, as far as I know, many, if any, Members of this body or the other body in the Capitol having had the opportunity fully to read it. Since then, of course, it has expanded. We have had an addi-
tional 20,000 pages of regulations pro-

 uncompressed, increasing rather exponen-
tially the impact of this law. The popu-
larity of the law is disappearing with time, just as the complexity of the law has not become less problematic in the intervening 3½-year period.

So as we look at this, we think about the fact that it is important for Con-
gress to listen to the American people. Again, today it has never been so easy to try with so few resources to be heard by a lot of people. But through the television company or something like that, through the Internet, by telephone, by paper or perhaps in more recent years they were listening on that side of DC, that side of the Capitol was listening. I applaud the Speaker of the House and the other leaders in the House of Representatives who did that. That suggests to me that they were listening on that side of the Capitol. They had many millions of Americans calling out on the telephone, through mail, e-mail, every conceivable medium for relief from this bill. They listened. They listened because they understand that the American people are being hurt by this. They ask the same questions the Senator (the Texan) and I and others have asked: How many more Americans will have to lose their jobs because of ObamaCare before Congress acts? How many more Americans will have to lose their wages or their hours cut as a result of this ill-conceived law they do something about this? How many more people will have to lose access to health coverage before Congress does something?
the most personal aspects of most people’s lives, into the health care industry. This is an industry that comprises a very significant portion of our Nation’s economy in an area in which people feel strongly about their own right, about their own innate, inalienable Rights, and the sovereignty begins at the top. It was the Revolution that overthrew the British monarchy and established the principles of liberty and self-governance. Thomas Jefferson referred to the Constitution as chains that bind the majority to the will of their sovereign, which is we the people. That is why our Constitution begins “We the People,” because sovereignty began at the top. It was the revolution of ideas that occurred. The founding of our Nation embodied two things. First, America began from the presupposition that our rights come from God. It is for that reason the Declaration Of Independence begins: “We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal,” that we are endowed—not by a king, not by a queen, not even by a President—but “endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.” That is and was a revolutionary idea, and it led to the second revolutionary aspect of the founding of our Nation which was the inverted concept of sovereignty. For millennia, sovereignty began at the top. It was the ruler who was called the sovereign. The word sovereignty derives from that notion. Of course, the sovereign is where sovereignty resides. The American Framers turned that notion on its head. We said: There is no sovereign. Sovereignty resides with the people. That is why our Constitution begins “We the People,” because this Nation was not founded by rulers, it was founded by elected officials, it wasn’t even founded by States. It was founded by we the people, the American people. That is the only place sovereignty has ever resided in the United States of America.

The Constitution, in turn, was created to lend power to government, not to give it, to lend it and to lend it, I would suggest, only in good behavior. Thomas Jefferson referred to the Constitution as a limiting document. He said: One person after another around the table said to me: TED, the single biggest obstacle I face in my business is ObamaCare. Hands down, not even close, there is nothing that comes close. It was striking. Of those 20, there were probably 4 or 5 of them who relayed some version of this same story. One was the fellow who owned the restaurant we were meeting in. He said: You know, we have a great opportunity to expand our business. I have an opportunity to make the restaurant even bigger, expand it, and from a business perspective, this opportunity looks good. But he said: You know, we have got between 20 and 30 employees. If we expand the business, we will go over 50. And if we go over 50, we are subject to ObamaCare. If that happens, I will go out of business. So you know what. I am not pursuing the expansion. I am not going to do it. We are going to stay the size we are.

One person after another around the table said the same thing. They had 30 employees, 35, 40 employees. They had great opportunities to expand our business. I have an opportunity to make the restaurant even bigger, expand it, and from a business perspective, this opportunity looks good. But he said: You know, we have got between 20 and 30 employees. If we expand the business, we will go over 50. And if we go over 50, we are subject to ObamaCare. If that happens, I will go out of business. So you know what, I am not pursuing the expansion. I am not going to do it. We are going to stay the size we are.

I want you to think about each of those 4 or 5 businesses and the 10 or 20 jobs that each of them didn’t create, isn’t creating right now because of ObamaCare. Then I want you to multiply that by thousands or tens of thousands of small businesses all across this country that could be creating jobs if we want you to think about all the people right now who are home wanting to work. There are, by the way, I will note, some politicians who suggest that everybody in this country are lazy and don’t want to work. I don’t believe that. I think Americans want to work.

Americans want the self-respect that comes from going to the office, from working, from providing for your family, from working to achieve the American dream. Do some people give up? Sure. Can you give in to hopelessness? Yes. When
you keep banging your head against a wall over and over again, trying to get a job, and you don’t get anywhere, it is only natural for people to feel despair. I want you to think of the millions of jobs we could have but for small businesses that are not growing, not expanding, that people can’t get.

Another small business owner around that table owned several fast food restaurants. She had a problem. She owned enough fast food restaurants that she had over 50 employees. I will mention that restaurant business and the fast food business side in particular is quite labor dependent. I doubt if there is a sector in this economy that has been hurt more than the labor in the fast food business. But her problem was she had enough stores so she was over 50 employees, so that strategy wouldn’t work for her. She described how she has already forcibly reduced the hours of every one of her employees to 29 hours per week.

I will tell you this woman almost began to tear up. She was not happy about this, to put it mildly. She said: Listen, we have been in business a long time. Many of these employees we have known 10 or 20 years. We build our business around people that are really very clever people—the millions of small business owners who aren’t growing, the millions of small business owners who are forcibly reducing their employees’ hours to 29 hours a week, the millions of small business owners who are considering moving operations overseas or have already because of ObamaCare. Why is the economy gasping for breath? Why are people not able to get jobs? Because ObamaCare is killing jobs, and the Senate should listen to the people. We need to make DC listen.

Mr. VITTER. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CRUZ. I am happy to yield for a question with the Senator:

Mr. VITTER. I thank the Senator. Does he acknowledge that he understands, as I do, that as this monstrosity goes into effect October 1 and as it has all of these really devastating impacts on individuals and small businesses, under a special illegal rule from the Obama administration, Congress and Washington get an exemption; they get a special pass; they get a special deal no other American gets under the law.

Mr. CRUZ. I thank the Senator for his question, and he is absolutely right. There are many scandalous aspects of ObamaCare: how it was passed—on a brutal partisan vote rammed through with late-night deals that have earned the nickname “Cornhusker kickoff,” which has sadly become part of modern political lore; and the Louisiana purchase, an extraordinary legislation that was the gift of our friend from the great State of Louisiana, who was not involved in that. And one of the most sorry aspects of ObamaCare is the aspect Senator VITTER refers to, which is that President Obama has chosen, at the behest of majority leader Harry Reid, at the behest of Democratic Members of the Senate, to exempt Members of Congress and their staff from the language of the statute, dissubject to the same exchanges and subject to the same regulations and burdens of ObamaCare that the American people are. I would ask my colleagues to consider the language of the statute and saying: You guys are friends of the administration. We are taking care of you.

I want to take a minute, in response to this question, to commend the Senate Majority leader. When ObamaCare was being passed, the Senate Majority leader thought of it as a train wreck, that it is not working—and the late-night deals that have earned the nickname “Cornhusker kickoff” were the late-night deals that have earned the nickname “Cornhusker kickoff” were the late-night deals that have earned the nickname “Cornhusker kickoff,” which has sadly become part of modern political lore; and the Louisiana purchase, an extraordinary legislation that was the gift of our friend from the great State of Louisiana, who was not involved in that. And one of the most sorry aspects of ObamaCare is the aspect Senator VITTER refers to, which is that President Obama has chosen, at the behest of majority leader Harry Reid, at the behest of Democratic Members of Congress, to exempt Members of Congress and their staff from the language of the statute, dissubject to the same exchanges and subject to the same regulations and burdens of ObamaCare that the American people are.

I would ask my colleagues to consider the language of the statute and saying: You guys are friends of the administration. We are taking care of you.

It has been reported—I was not serving in this body at the time—that amendment was voted on and accepted because Democratic Senators believed the bill would go to conference and in the conference committee they could strip it out and it would magically disappear. But they got into all those procedural games it took to pass it, they didn’t have the opportunity to do that, and suddenly, horror of all horrors, this bill saying Congress should be bound by the same rules as the American people became the law.

So what happened? Majority leader Harry Reid and Democratic Senators had a closed-door meeting with the President here in the Capitol where they said, according to public news reports: Let us out of ObamaCare. We don’t want to be in these exchanges.

One would assume they are reading the same news reports the rest of us are reading—that ObamaCare is a train wreck, that it is not working—and the late-night deals that have earned the nickname “Cornhusker kickoff” were the late-night deals that have earned the nickname “Cornhusker kickoff,” which has sadly become part of modern political lore; and the Louisiana purchase, an extraordinary legislation that was the gift of our friend from the great State of Louisiana, who was not involved in that. And one of the most sorry aspects of ObamaCare is the aspect Senator VITTER refers to, which is that President Obama has chosen, at the behest of majority leader Harry Reid, at the behest of Democratic Members of Congress, to exempt Members of Congress and their staff from the language of the statute, dissubject to the same exchanges and subject to the same regulations and burdens of ObamaCare that the American people are. I would ask my colleagues to consider the language of the statute and saying: You guys are friends of the administration. We are taking care of you.

It has been reported—I was not serving in this body at the time—that amendment was voted on and accepted because Democratic Senators believed the bill would go to conference and in the conference committee they could strip it out and it would magically disappear. But they got into all those procedural games it took to pass it, they didn’t have the opportunity to do that, and suddenly, horror of all horrors, this bill saying Congress should be bound by the same rules as the American people became the law.

So what happened? Majority leader Harry Reid and Democratic Senators had a closed-door meeting with the President here in the Capitol where they said, according to public news reports: Let us out of ObamaCare. We don’t want to be in these exchanges.

One would assume they are reading the same news reports the rest of us are reading—that ObamaCare is a train wreck, that it is not working—and the late-night deals that have earned the nickname “Cornhusker kickoff” were the late-night deals that have earned the nickname “Cornhusker kickoff,” which has sadly become part of modern political lore; and the Louisiana purchase, an extraordinary legislation that was the gift of our friend from the great State of Louisiana, who was not involved in that. And one of the most sorry aspects of ObamaCare is the aspect Senator VITTER refers to, which is that President Obama has chosen, at the behest of majority leader Harry Reid, at the behest of Democratic Members of Congress, to exempt Members of Congress and their staff from the language of the statute, dissubject to the same exchanges and subject to the same regulations and burdens of ObamaCare that the American people are. I would ask my colleagues to consider the language of the statute and saying: You guys are friends of the administration. We are taking care of you.
In fact, I would note that the majority leader and the junior Senator from California, as I understand from public news reports, proposed a response to the Vitter amendment that said any Senator who votes for the Vitter amendment—regardless of whether it passes—will be defrocked. In favor of it—he or she will lose their health insurance.

I have to admit that when I first heard of this proposed amendment, I shook my head. I am not sure what the amendment is. I have never heard of such a thing, and I suggested to a friend who is a law professor that that would make a marvelous law school final exam. Imagine this amendment being passed into law and asking your law students to catalog all of the myriad ways in which such a proposal would be unconstitutional. In fact, I made this point to the law professor I was talking to. I said: If you as a private citizen came to any Member of the Senate and said: Senator, I want you to know that I am going to pay you thousands of dollars that you can deposit into your personal bank account, your, Mr. Law Professor, Mr. Private Citizen, would promptly and quite rightly be prosecuted. It is a criminal offense. It is a felony.

If, on the other hand, you or any other American citizen went to a U.S. Senator—went to Senator Vitter—and said: Senator Vitter, if you don’t vote the way I want you to vote, I am going to take hundreds of thousands of dollars out of your personal bank account, I am going to extract them forcibly from your personal bank account, well, as I told the law professor, then you would be guilty of extortion and would be charged and no doubt criminally convicted because under the black letter definition, that conduct—threatening to pay someone individually thousands of dollars or take thousands of dollars away from them as a direct quid pro quo for how a Member votes, constitutes either bribery or extortion.

Now, let me be clear: No Member of this body is guilty of bribery or extortion. Why? The simplest reason is because the Constitution’s speech and debate clause protects all of us, such that given their action was proposing an amendment themselves, there is a constitutional immunity. So I am not suggesting that anyone is guilty of bribery or extortion. But I am saying that if any private citizen who didn’t happen to be a Member of the Senate did the exact same thing as the suggested content of their amendment, he or she would have committed a felony under the plain text of those definitions.

So I urge you to commend Senator Vitter for shining a light on basic fairness, for enduring the vilification that was unfairly directed his way, and for making the point that outside of Washington is simple common sense.
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I have had one staff member already indicate she would retire after many years of service, and the possibility of being put on ObamaCare was a real factor in that decision.

If we lose some good talent from Congress, that will be a shame and a hardship for every office. But what does that mean? If ObamaCare is such a disaster that congressional staffers—and, mind you, a lot of these congressional staffers who may tender their letters of resignation are staffers working for Democratic Senators who drafted ObamaCare, who fight for ObamaCare every day—then it says that staffers would be willing to quit because the quality of health care under ObamaCare would be so poor that they would rather go somewhere else than be subject to those laws? I think that speaks volumes.

Neither Senator VITTER nor I in the long term has any interest in seeing congressional staff and Federal employees on ObamaCare, but it does have the value of highlighting how bad it is. If you lose talent that you want to leave the American people stuck in ObamaCare, then we ought to be subject to the same rules. If we are not willing to live under those rules, if we say, Wow, ObamaCare scares the heck out of us, and we don’t want to be subject to it, then the proper answer is not to vilify the Senator from Louisiana or any other Senator in this body. The proper answer is to say, in fact, let’s suggest something that would have a powerful clarifying impact on this body.

If only Senators would behave as if their constituents were at least as important as their congressional staff; if only Senators were to behave as if their constituents were at least as important as they are—to be honest, our constituents are more important. Our constituents are our bosses. They are the reason we are fighting. The fact that ObamaCare is content to leave the American people stuck in ObamaCare, then we ought to be subject to the same rules. If we are not willing to live under those rules, if we say, Wow, ObamaCare scares the heck out of us, and we don’t want to be subject to it, then the proper answer is not to vilify the Senator from Louisiana or any other Senator in this body. The proper answer is to say, in fact, let’s suggest something that would have a powerful clarifying impact on this body.
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an announcement, you don't take questions on it, you simply put a blog posting from a midlevel staffer, that counts as 'quietly.'

It hasn't been quiet since then because everyone happened to notice. So my prediction right now is if we get past this, if the midlevel staffer in this body who defend the status quo—and, wow, are there a lot of forces that defend the status quo. There are a lot of people with a vested interest in maintaining the status quo. If they prevail, if ObamaCare goes into effect before the end of this President's administration, mark my words, you will see an exemption for labor unions just like the exemption for big business, just like the exemption for Members of Congress.

What are we left with then? We are left with a system where ObamaCare is a rule for, as Leona Helmsley so famously described them, the little people. For everybody who doesn't have power and juice and connections in Washington for everyone—look for the men and women at home, maybe you have an army of lobbyists working for you. Maybe you have Senators' cell phones on your speed dial. Maybe you can walk the corridors of power. In that case, you get an exemption.

But if you are just a hard-working American, if you are just trying to provide for your family, if you are just trying to do an honest day's work, make your community better, raise your children, the message this President has sent—and sadly the message the Senate has sent—is you don't count. We are going to treat everybody else better than you.

That is exactly backward. It is the hard-working American we work for, not the lobbyists with tassels on their loafers who wander the halls but the single mom in a diner. They are the people who are losing.

I want to talk about the harm to jobs and economic growth that is coming from ObamaCare. Americans continue to suffer from high unemployment and severe underemployment. Instead of helping job growth, ObamaCare's mandates and costs are causing businesses to stop hiring workers, to cut employees' hours, and they are increasing the costs to operate businesses. Small businesses in particular are being hammered by ObamaCare.

Here are unemployment statistics on unemployment and underemployment. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics report for August of 2013, there are 11.3 million unemployed persons. The unemployment rate, the official unemployment rate is listed at 7.3 percent. Yet college graduates, for example, then the message this President has sent—and sadly the message the Senate has sent—is you don't count. We are going to treat everybody else better than you.
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watch a movie three times and have no idea of what was going on the first, second or third time. But then he would do it again and do it again.

The human brain is a miraculous thing. As he would watch the movie two or three times, by the second time you start picking up context, start picking up what was going on and start following the plot. By the third time he would start following it even more. So relatively quickly my father learned English.

I note he had a pretty exquisite incentive to learn English. His incentive to learn English was if he didn’t, he was going to flunk out of school because he caused the waves taking his classes in English. He took mostly math classes and math was the sort of thing you did not need as much language as you do in other topics. But if he didn’t learn English pretty fast, he was going to flunk out of college.

Once he learned English, he managed, at the restaurant he was working at, to get a promotion. He got a promotion to be a cook. Being a cook, that was good. Looking back it was a lot better than being a dishwasher. It paid a little bit more. I don’t know how much he got paid being a cook, but it paid better than 50 cents an hour. He had to speak enough English, so when someone ordered, let me get a steak and potatoes, he had to know what that was and not give them scrambled eggs. So he learned enough to be a cook and respond to the orders.

The place he cooked was a place called Benihana. The menu was similar to Denny’s. If he hadn’t learned English pretty fast, he would have been a dishwasher. It was a place where the cooks were in front of the people. It doesn’t exist anymore, but my father described it as a sort of Denny’s. Imagine Denny’s combined with Benihana. The menu was similar to Denny’s. If he hadn’t learned English, he would have been a dishwasher. It was a very cool way to do it.

As a young kid, one of the things you do is you take some spinach and mix it into the eggs, chopped up ham in it. He did it two ways. No. 1, the easy way, is he put green food coloring into the eggs. He did it anyway—he invented green eggs and ham.

He had all sorts of clever final exam questions that he would give. He taught college algebra. I remember one of his final exam questions was: You have a triangle with sides 11, 20, and 9. Compute the area.

You would have students who would write pages and pages, trying to put all these various equations together, trying to figure out the area. Almost all of them were wrong. It is a basic rule of geometry, for a triangle the sum of any two sides is greater than the third side or else they don’t actually meet. A triangle with sides of 20, 11, and 9—11 and 9 add up to 20. That is a straight line. The area is zero.

So he enjoyed kind of coming up with clever final exam questions. That was one of them.

But from there, after being a teaching assistant, he applied for and got a job with IBM as a computer programmer. This was, I think, 1962, 1963. It was in the early 1960s. From there he got the skills as a computer programmer and got a job with IBM as a computer programmer. He worked in the oil and gas industry. Subsequently, with my mother, he went on to start a small business, a seismic data processing company in the oil and gas business.

So when I was a kid, as I grew up, my parents were small business owners. When I talk about small businesses, similar to a great many Americans, the majority of Americans, it is not a hypothetical. I have grown up as the son of small business owners, seeing how hard he worked trying to run a small business. In fact, I saw my parents’ business go bankrupt when I was in high school. I saw the ups and the down sides of being in a small business. It isn’t easy.

If my father had not been able to get that first job washing dishes and making 50 cents an hour, he never would have gotten his second job as a cook. If he hadn’t gotten his second job, he wouldn’t have gotten his third job as a teaching assistant. The area is zero. So he enjoyed kind of coming up with clever final exam questions. That was one of them.

By the third time he was enjoying kind of coming up with clever final exam questions. That was one of them.

Earlier, the Senator from Utah talked about opportunity and the American dream. When we look at a statistic, such as the fact that African-American teenage unemployment is 38.2 percent, we are talking about a generation of young people who are being denied a fair chance at the American dream. If we look at economic growth, according to the Bureau of Economic Affairs, GDP growth over the last four quarters has been an abysmal 1.6 percent. The historic average since World War II is 3.3 percent. Our economy is stagnant, and ObamaCare is a big part of the reason.

So I ask the Presiding Officer, where is the urgency in this body? When the President goes home and talks to the men and women in West Virginia—or the men and women in Texas—he must hear that they are hurting. They understand that 1.6 percent economic growth is unacceptable and it is hurting the American people.

Where is the urgency to say: We have to stand and do something to turn it around. Jobs are being lost because of ObamaCare. A U.S. Chamber of Commerce survey of small businesses in 2013 found that 71 percent of small businesses say ObamaCare makes it harder to hire workers. The study also found that two-thirds of small businesses are not ready to comply with ObamaCare rules.

Why do we care about small businesses? Look, on one level, we care about the entrepreneurs—the Horatio Algers and the people working toward the American dream. But on a more fundamental level, small businesses produce two-thirds of the new jobs in this country. If small businesses are suffering, jobs are suffering and America suffers.

ObamaCare is an absolute disaster for small businesses. Forty-one percent of small business owners have held off on plans to hire new employees, and 38
percent say they are holding off on plans to grow their businesses in direct response to the law.

By the way, the most egregious parts of ObamaCare still have not kicked in. Forty-eight percent of small businesses own their own place of business, and that might be a reminder of what it means. Less than 10 percent say it is good for business.

Jamie Richardson of White Castle explained how ObamaCare is impacting her business: In the 5 years prior to the health care law, we were opening an average of eight new White Castle restaurants each year. In 2013 we plan to just open two new locations. While other factors have slowed our growth, it is the mounting uncertainty surrounding the health care law that brought us to a standstill.

I want the Presiding Officer to think about that for a second. They were opening eight White Castle restaurants a year—I like their little burgers—and that is 24 places we can't go to get a White Castle burger. But that is not the real hardship. The real hardship is all the jobs that are lost from those 24 restaurants that didn't open. Every one of those stores would have multiple shifts with managers, cashiers, or kids just mopping the floor. All those jobs would have been the economic ladder toward the American dream.

Even within a fast food restaurant there has been tremendous opportunity for investment. Maybe you get hired mopping a floor because you don't have any other skills or, like my dad, washing dishes because you don't have any other skills. If you work a little while, maybe you can move over to the fries and then to the griddle. You can move to the cashier desk and learn how to count money. Some of kids don't know how to count change. Sadly, because of the educational challenges we have, a lot of kids don't have the skill to count change yet. They can learn that. Then, if you demonstrate hard work, perseverance, and customer service, maybe you will get promoted to assistant manager, then manager, and then who knows.

Just a few weeks ago I had dinner with a number of franchisees who own fast food places for one person over a very well-known hamburger chain. I listened to their stories. I start most meetings, if they are small enough that this is feasible—like the Kerrville small business gathering—by asking them to go around and share an issue that is of a concern to them. I remember one gentleman, an African-American gentleman, who described exactly that path. He described how he got hired in an entry-level position at a fast food restaurant, developed skills, advanced to assistant manager and then as a manager. After that, he saved up and bought his own restaurant.

It was interesting. There were people—and some of the franchise owners had pretty extensive backgrounds. I think there was one fellow who had 27 fast food restaurants. So there were some people who were very successful businesspeople. I remember this African-American gentleman who had relatively recently saved up to buy his first restaurant that he owned and the pride he justifiably felt—and the pride I felt. I mean, what an incredible country. What was interesting is he described the exact same challenges as the fellow who owned 27 restaurants and was far wealthier and had a far bigger business.

What all of them said as we were going around the table was that ObamaCare is devastating. They didn’t say it was sort of a little problem. They didn’t say it was making life more difficult. They said: It is devastating. It is going to put us out of business. We don't know what to do. This is a disaster for business.

A March 2013 Federal Reserve report on current Federal economic conditions explains that employers in several Federal Reserve districts cited the effects of the ObamaCare act as reasons for planning layoffs and reluctance to hire more staff.

In May 2013 Moody’s economist Mark Zandi noted a slowdown in small business hiring due to ObamaCare.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, in the second quarter of 2013 small business survey, found that Washington policies continue to hamper hiring and growth, with over a quarter of small businesses saying they had lost employees in the last year. They cited health care as the very top concern.

Concern about ObamaCare has increased by 10 points since June of 2011 and by 4 points just last quarter. Seventy-one percent of small businesses say the health care law makes it harder to hire workers; 75 percent say they are preparing for the requirements of the law—including participation in the marketplaces. Among small businesses that will be impacted by the employer mandate, one-half of small businesses say they will either cut hours to reduce full-time employees or replace full-time employees with part-time workers to avoid the mandate. Twenty-four percent say they will reduce hiring to stay under 50 employees.

I want to repeat those numbers because those numbers are deeply troubling. Among small businesses that will be impacted by the employer mandate, one-half—50 percent—say they will either cut hours to reduce full-time employees or replace full-time employees with part-time workers to avoid the mandate. We are not talking about a few small businesses, we are talking about half of them. Twenty-four percent say they will reduce hiring to stay under 50 employees.

The outlook for hiring remains grim. The majority—61 percent—of small businesses do not have plans to hire next year.

A Grand Rapids, MI company reported that they had to lay off over 200 employees due to the medical device tax. Let's think about that. In Grand Rapids, MI, there are 1,000 people out of a job directly because of ObamaCare. Now let's think of their spouses and their kids. One of the testimony from the hearing that day was a woman whose family lost his or her job because of ObamaCare.

On September 18, 2013, the world-renowned Cleveland Clinic announced that it would cut jobs and slash 5 to 6 percent of its $6 billion annual budget to prepare for ObamaCare. This is not just impacting fast food restaurants, this is impacting everyone. The Cleveland Clinic has a $6 billion annual budget, and yet they are forced to fire employees. The Cleveland Clinic is Ohio's largest employer.

Every 4 years during the Presidential election, both parties purport to care passionately about what happens in the great State of Ohio. Both parties focus and descend on Ohio—henceful of other swing States—as the center of the universe. Yet, as we sit here now in 2013—not a Presidential election—somehow the concern about what is happening to the Cleveland Clinic in Ohio has diminished. The Cleveland Clinic is Cleveland's largest employer, and it is the second largest employer in the State of Ohio after Walmart.

I would suggest that if all of the folks from this body and the political parties who descend on Ohio every 4 years are genuinely concerned about what is occurring in Ohio in a non-Presidential year we should see the floor of this Senate filled with Senators and Congressmen concerned about the impact ObamaCare is having directly on Cleveland and the State of Ohio.

Cleveland Clinic is responsible for 80 percent of the economic output of northeastern Ohio, according to a 2009 study. It is the largest provider of Ohio Medicaid health coverage for the poor, the program that will expand to cover uninsured Americans under ObamaCare.

The Cleveland Clinic has close to 100 locations around the State. They employ 3,000 doctors. Its main campus is recognized worldwide for its cancer and cardiovascular treatments.

(Ms. WARREN assumed the Chair.)
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You want to talk about direct job losses from ObamaCare, go to Cleveland, OH, go to those working at the Cleveland Clinic, go to those depending on the Cleveland Clinic for health care, and that is one very real manifestation of that problem is ObamaCare. According to the Star-Ledger, in a story printed on September 12, 2013, Barnabas Health, which employs over 19,000 people, is laying off employees. Why? Well, according to Barnabas Health, the reason is ObamaCare. According to a spokeswoman for Barnabas Health:

Healthcare reform, in combination with Medicare cuts, more patients seeking outpatient care, increasing patient volumes—as a result, we have made the difficult decision to reduce our workforce. Decisions like this are never easy and we are working with these employees to help them look for other opportunities within the Barnabas Health system.

This is not us putting words in their mouths, this on the ground in the States dealing with the very real struggles and the disaster that is ObamaCare. The problem we face in Washington is that our elected officials are listening and needed to make DC listen. We need to make elected officials in both parties listen to the very real hardship that is coming from ObamaCare. I would like to share a number of real constituent letters concerning ObamaCare. So this is not me speaking. As I said at the outset, the reason Congress is held in such disrespect, so little approval, is because for many years now elected officials in both parties have refused to listen to the people, and there is a sense of despair that no matter what the American people say, our elected officials will not listen because they are more interested in themselves, they are more interested in getting an exemption for Members of Congress from ObamaCare than they are on fixing the problem for the American people. And that level of disillusionment is national. It is based on a very real problem. Yet I am inspired that if and when the American people stand and make their voices heard, our politicians will have no choice but to listen.

I remember early on—Madam President, you and I are relatively new in this body. We have been here 9 months. I remember early on standing at this very desk along with my friend Senator Ted Cruz and his historic filibuster on drones. I remember when Senator Paul began that filibuster, many Members of this body viewed what he was doing as curious, if not quixotic, as a strange issue that most Members of this body did not appear to be very concerned about. We saw something incredible happen during that time, which is the American people got engaged, got involved, began speaking out, and it transformed the debate. As a result of the American people’s involvement, it transformed the debate.

If you want Washington to listen, the only way that will happen is if it comes from the American people. So let me read some letters from American people who do not have the opportunity to come to the Senate floor. I hope in a very small way to provide a voice for them.

A small business from Alice, TX, wrote, on August 9, 2013:

We, the undersigned employees . . . are growing increasingly concerned with the apparent disregard for small businesses and the middle class that is on display by the United States government. We are trying to figure out how we are going to cope with the 14% increase in health insurance premiums we are facing, despite the fact that we have a lower average salary ratio than we have had at any point in our 21-year history. The increase is because of insurance companies preparing for new taxes and unreasonable requirements within ObamaCare.

On top of struggling to find the means to cover our own group of employees, our government now makes it clear that part of the massive amount of taxes we pay a year will be used to cover 75% of health insurance costs for Members of Congress AND their staff—while dying day, shielded . . . big business, unions, government agencies, and various other Affordable Care Act supporters, it is clear the burden will rest firmly on middle class small businesses like us. . .

We strongly encourage our elected officials to place a higher importance on public service than self-service.

Let me read that sentence again: ‘‘We strongly encourage our elected officials to place a higher importance on public service than self-service.’’

We are hurting badly because of this, as are many disillusioned businesses with whom we communicate daily, sending . . . nationwide report hiring freezes and layoffs due to increased costs on businesses large and small. The weight is too heavy at the worst time, and in result the economy will soon break. We urge Congress to defund or repeal the Affordable Care Act with no further delay. . .

That is not me speaking. That is from a small business in Alice, TX, who would note, that is not even the CEO speaking. That is a letter signed by the employees of that small business because they are hurting.

But let me note, it is not limited to the State of Texas, I guarantee you, there are people hurting in every one of the 50 States, every one of the States we represent. A commercial real estate broker from Chesapeake City, VA, wrote, on September 20, 2013:

I also wanted to share with you how ObamaCare is affecting my business. I am a commercial real estate broker in Virginia and am already feeling the effects of this disastrous bill. I am currently in the process of analyzing an apartment portfolio for sale for a client and recently the occupancy has dropped dramatically in this class C low-income community. The community is not subsidized as these tenants are paying out of pocket for the rent. Most of the tenants work in fast food, janitorial, and low paying service related jobs. A great deal of them had their hours cut to 29.5 hours per week and cannot pay the rent.

So they are losing their housing. I want you to think for a second about the spiral that comes from this. If you have someone who is working as a janitor, if you have someone who is working flipping burgers, if you have someone who works as a dishwasher, and they have their hours forcibly reduced to 29 hours a week, as so many people across this country are having happen because of ObamaCare, they cannot provide for their family on that, so they cannot pay the rent, these people cannot. But not being able to pay the rent means some of them may move to government housing. And what is the answer? Look, they are losing their hours because of ObamaCare. The answer is not: We will give them a rent subsidy. Let’s tax people even more. First let’s pass rules and laws and regulations that prevent people from getting decent jobs. Then let’s jack up the taxes even more so we can pay them to subsidize their rent and subsidize their housing because they cannot afford to pay their rent, they cannot afford to pay their housing because of a law we passed that forcibly reduced their hours. That is the path to destruction in this country.

Far better that we get back to our founding principles, far better that we get back to what has made America great, which is our free enterprise system—a robust, free enterprise system that encourages small businesses to grow and to prosper, that encourages people working a job as a janitor to work hard and get a promotion and climb that ladder, to pay their own rent, to pay for their own food for their kids, to work and to advance.

These cries are coming from all across the country. Yet Washington is not listening. We need to make DC listen.

A small business owner from Port Clinton, OH, wrote, on September 19, 2013:

I strongly urge you to stand up for the middle class and small business and vote to DEFUND ObamaCare. As a small business owner, we have always offered health insurance. After meeting with our health insurance representative, we learned that the lowest plan offered is estimated to be about $400 a person, twice what we pay now for excellent coverage. . . .
With big business and government being exempted from this policy, again the SMALL BUSINESS OWNER and individual are left with all the costs for everyone else. This could send us up closing our book. For and then there will be 15 more individual collecting from the government.

A constituent from Nacogdoches, TX, wrote, on May 29, 2013: I need a little help here! Can you explain something to me? My health insurance premiums for my wife, three children and myself were $850 or so back in 2010. After ObamaCare was passed my premiums are now $1,400 or so. This January, when ObamaCare is implemented it is estimated by Blue Cross Blue Shield I could see a 25% increase. That will be in the amount $1,800 a month for premiums plus on my HSA plan my deductible is $10,000. If my calculator is correct, that is $21,600 per year out of my pocket before the insurance company pays a penny.

I also own a small business and have four others on our group plan. If this cost increases across the board with the others as well, my business will stop the benefit of insurance and each will be on their own to get coverage. I understood this health care overhaul from floor to floor. From where I am sitting it is only a burden. If you can, please repeal this before it gets worse. We are hearing these voices from Americans all over the country, both Republicans and Democrats. I am a body. All we need to do is listen to the people. A veterinarian from Montgomery, TX, wrote on February 20, 2013:

I would like to bring to your attention a problem I am having with my insurance. I had group health insurance with a company even after I became disabled. And in the past had to use a group health care policy offered by the American Veterinary Medical Association. I am currently under my husband's insurance. However, a number of my colleagues use one of the various plans AVMA offers. The AVMA insurance is being canceled at the end of the year. This decision is due directly to ObamaCare. Here is the text of that notification. Group Health and Life Insurance Trust Programs and New York Life affiliates the program's demise. I am very concerned.

A constituent from Euless, TX, wrote on July 3, 2013:

I got a letter in May of this year informing me that I was going to lose that medical coverage come 2014. Since we are both on a fixed income, it will be impossible for us to maintain mortgage payments for all of our health costs. Repeal ObamaCare.

The rules of the Senate will not allow her or any other small business owner to walk onto the Senate floor and speak out, to say: Why am I losing my health insurance? Why am I struggling? Why is my business going under?

but if this body were operating the way it should, there should be 100 voices; 100 of us, Democrats and Republicans, should be standing side by side and reading these letters like this. You know what. These are our bosses. These are the people we work for. They are struggling.

These letters I am reading are not ideological letters. They are not coming from anywhere but my backyard. These are people who are seeing on the ground this law is not working. Yet DC does not listen to them. The Democrats in this body tell America: ObamaCare is great. ObamaCare is terrific. The Republicans in this body, sadly more than a few of them, say: We will take lots and lots of symbolic votes against ObamaCare, but there is nothing we can do. If every Republican Senator stands together and votes no on cloture this Friday or Saturday, there is something we can do. We can stand and say: We are listening to the American people. This law is not working and people are suffering.

They are not interested in political games. They are not interested in show votes. They are not interested in the fact that if the majority leader succeeds in cutting off debate on this bill and there is a 51-vote threshold on an amendment to fund ObamaCare, at that point every Republican will happily vote no. That may be solicited from the personal political perspectives of the Republicans in this body, but it does not reflect the American people’s view. It does not benefit the American people. It does not stop ObamaCare. It does not fix the problem. That is what we should be doing. A constituent from Euluss, TX, wrote on July 3, 2013:

I have been disabled since 1997 and on a fixed income. My wife lost her job of 16 years in 2008 and was not able to find a good job so she forced to take her Social Security last year. I have been diagnosed with diabetes and her medical costs are expensive. Luckily, I was paying for medical and long-term disability insurance when I was working, so I was able to continue the medical insurance with a company even after I became disabled.
other? Some, like the President, have said: Oh, Republicans, they just want 100 percent of what they want or they are going to shut down government.

Well, can you say something so patently false and get away with it, is my question? The President wants 100 percent of what he wants. He wants ObamaCare as he passed it with only Democrats. He wants it never to be changed. He wants no compromise. He wants what he wants or he is willing to shut down the government. That is what he is demanding.

ObamaCare was passed with only Democrats, no Republican input, no Republican votes. When people are saying there are problems, his own people are saying there are problems. The Teamsters have said there is a problem. Authors of the bill are saying it is a train wreck. The former President came out this week and said: It is going to hurt the people it was intended to help.

So why did we get all of these people saying: For goodness sakes, slow this train down. Stop this train. Stop this train wreck of ObamaCare. All everybody cries about is: Oh, somebody wants to shut down the government. The President does not want to compromise.

What we are talking about is, do we not want to spend money on something that is not going to work and hurt the people—precisely the people it was intended to help. But the thing is, how do we fix it? What do we do? Can we scrap the whole thing? Well, the Democrats control one body, we control the other body, they control the Presidency. Historically what would happen, and what I think the American people would like to see, is, we stand up, as the Senator from Texas is, and say what we are for. We are for a different solution. We are for competition. We are for the free markets. We are for bringing down prices. Everybody wants to pay a lower price. We went through this whole debacle of giving people ObamaCare and it is going to be expensive. Everybody is going to pay more.

Many people still will not have insurance. The ones who do have insurance are going to pay more. So what would we like? Why are we here today? Why is the Senator from Texas here today? To say to the President: We need to talk. What does the President say? He says: This is a highway.

When the American people said they want dialog between Republicans and Democrats, how do we get there? We have to stand up, as what we believe in so they will come and talk. Does it mean something to make ObamaCare less bad? I know we would both like to repeal it, but would the Senator accept anything in between?

Mr. CRUZ. I thank the Senator from Kentucky for his very fine question. Let me respond directly to the question that I remember not too many months ago standing on this same Senate floor in the midst of the Senator’s historic filibuster. I will say it was one of the proudest moments of my life. Indeed, during that filibuster on drones, that was the first time I had ever spoken on the Senate floor.

I have observed multiple times that I will go to my grave in debt to RAND PAUL, to have the opportunity for the first time—and there will only be one first time that anyone gets to speak on this floor—to have that first time be in support of that tremendous filibuster that mobilized and unified the American people.

I will note that one of the things I remember the Senator shared with me afterward was the advice he just gave a minute ago. I remember asking: What do you think? The Senator was pretty weary at the end. His comment at the time was, well, I wish I had worn more comfortable shoes. I will confess I thought about that. That struck me as pretty good advice.

I am going to make an embarrassing admission that I will get to the question in a second, but I wanted to make an embarrassing admission first. For many years, when I was in private practice and when I was solicitor general, I wore a particular pair of boots, my argument boots. They were black ostrich skin. Litigators are kind of superstitious, so anytime I went into court to argue a case I wore my argument boots. I had them resoled four or five times.

When I had the great honor of serving in this body, of being sworn into the Senate, when I was sworn in standing on the steps just in front of us, I wore my argument boots. I have worn them every day since. I don’t believe there has been a day on this Senate floor that I haven’t worn my argument boots.

I had a choice with which I was confronted, which was do I follow through with my arguments or do I listen to the very sage counsel from my friend from Kentucky and go with more comfortable shoes. I will embarrassingly admit that I took the coward’s way out. I went and purchased some black tennis shoes. Actually, I think they are the same model the senior Senator from Utah ORRIN HATCH wears on a regular basis. I am not in my argument boots, and I will confess I do feel pretty embarrassed by that. I am pretty sure, since we are on the Senate floor and C-SPAN is covering it, that this may not be covered by the priest-penitent privilege, but I do feel it is a question of sorts.

The question Senator RAND PAUL asked was an excellent question. His question was whether I or anyone here wishes to shut down the government. The answer is absolutely not. We should not shut down the government. We should fund every bit of the government, every aspect of the government, 100 percent of the government except for ObamaCare. That is what the House of Representatives did. The House of Representatives—232 Members of the House, including 2 Democrats—voted to fund every bit of the Federal Government 100 percent of it, except for ObamaCare.

I would note that last night on the floor of the Senate, I asked the majority leader to consent to passing the continuing resolution the House passed, passing it into law. Had the majority leader not stood there and said: I object, the continuing resolution would be passed into law and the government would not be shutting down. The majority leader had every opportunity to not shut down the government.

Let me be absolutely clear. We should not shut down the government. I sincerely hope Senator REID and President Obama do not choose to force a government shutdown simply to force ObamaCare on the American people. That would be a mistake. Instead, what we should do is listen to the American people. Make DC listen.

Mr. PAUL. Would the Senator yield for a quick question?

Mr. CRUZ. I am happy to yield for a quick question without yielding the floor.

Mr. PAUL. Since we are making it clear, the Republican message and alternative here is not to shut down the government; our desire is to have no ObamaCare. We desire not to have it. We think he went in the wrong direction. But we don’t control the government. We don’t control the government. We don’t control the Senate. It is controlled by the opposition party. We don’t control the Presidency.

My question to the Senator is, if he can’t get everything he wants, if he...
Mr. CRUZ. I thank the Senator from Kansas for that question. I think it is a very good question.

The Senator's question was would I introduce a bill that funds one penny of ObamaCare, that responds to the people who are suffering from ObamaCare, that is a middle ground that funds ObamaCare partially, no. Why? Because, as I have repeatedly told the American people, as I have told Texas, I will not vote for a continuing resolution that funds ObamaCare. But that being said, are there Members of our conference who would like to see a compromise, who would like to see a middle ground that is perhaps not what I very much want and will fight for with every ounce of strength I have but that mitigates some of the damage of ObamaCare, that responds to the people who are suffering from ObamaCare, I think there are quite a few Senators who would like to see that happen.

If Republicans roll over on the closure vote on Saturday, if we allow the majority leader to fund ObamaCare with 51 votes, we will get no compromise. There will be no middle ground because there will be no reason to compromise. It is much like a poker game. If you look at the Senator from Kentucky—many of his libertarian supporters enjoy a good game of poker. As a Texan, I will admit to not being entirely adverse to it myself. In a game of poker, if somebody makes a bet and you can't make it, if you cannot 'fold,' you will lose 100 percent of your poker games. That is a path to losing.

For those Members of the Republican caucus who were perhaps not as adamant that we should insist on a complete and total defund now, I don't intend to waiver from that position, but there may be others who disagree.

If you want to get to any middle ground that is not a symbolic vote to tell our constituents but that actually changes the law to make things better for the men and women at home, to mitigate the harms of ObamaCare, the only way to do so is for Republicans to stand united and to deny the majority leader the ability to fund ObamaCare on a 51-vote partisan vote. Mr. ROBERTS. Would the courageous Senator from Texas yield for a question?

Mr. CRUZ. I yield for a question without yielding the floor.

Mr. ROBERTS. Let me ask the Senator a question to cut to the chase. Let's get to the bottom line. Former Speaker of the House NANCY PELOSI, our respected leader of the Senate, HARRY REID, because of his position, Secretary of Health and Human Services Kathleen Sebelius, and President Barack Obama have all said publicly that the Affordable Care Act is the first step to a single-payer system. Listen to the folks on the other side of the aisle, and many of them say the same thing.

We can call it a single-payer system, we can call it national health insurance, but is this not the first step toward socialized health care—socialized health care—and is stopping socialized health care worth pulling all of the stops and fighting the fight?

Mr. CRUZ. I thank my friend from Kentucky for that very fair question. He is exactly right. Socialized medicine is—and has been everywhere it has been implemented in the world—a disaster. ObamaCare—it's intended purpose is to lead us unavoidably down the path of socialized medicine.

I thank the Senator from Kansas for his good question on that front and for his leadership.

I would note that there are some Republicans, some commentators who have said: Don't fight this fight. Don't fight to defund. Why? Because ObamaCare is going to collapse on its own weight. If we just stay quiet, we don't take any risks. Give it time; it is getting worse and worse. Stay out of this fight; it is going to collapse on its own weight. And there is both truth and falsity in that prediction. There is no doubt that ObamaCare is going to collapse. But the problem is that the way it will collapse, if it is implemented, is likely to permanently damage the private health care system, which will result in millions of people losing their health insurance and having no ability to go back. That is what enables Majority Leader Reid to go on television and say: Fear not, this is the way to go. We will see a two-tier system, and the public will be divided because when ObamaCare collapses in shambles—he doesn't say this, but this is the necessary reasoning that leads him to this—it will take down the private health insurance business with it, so there will be nothing left.

Listen, I commend the majority leader for his candor. I mean, there is a degree of courage in embracing socialized medicine. There are a number of Members of the Democratic caucus who embrace socialized medicine. I think every one of them shows courage and candor. I am very happy to debate in great detail whether socialized medicine would be good or bad for this Nation.

I don't think the American people are conflicted. If you look at the nations that have socialized medicine, everywhere it has been implemented you see low quality, you see scarcity, you see waiting periods, you see government bureaucrats getting between you and your doctor. If you go in for government treatment, you may be told that you are going to have to wait 6 months, you are going to have to wait a year or you know what. A bureaucracy in the ministry of whatchamacallit has determined you don't get that treatment. That is what has happened in every socialized medicine country in the world. And so those on the Republican side, those commentators who say this is a risky fight, I have never once suggested this is an easy fight. But in my 42 years on Earth, I have yet to see any fight that
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is worthwhile that is easy. In his years as a marine, I would venture to guess that Senator ROBERTS never saw a fight that mattered that was easy. None of us were elected to this body to do easy things.

If a majority leader is right, that leaving ObamaCare alone will necessarily lead us to socialized medicine because private health insurance will collapse—ObamaCare will collapse—and there will be nothing left, what a call to urgency. Indeed, I would say the majority leader, in making that argument, should be one of the most effective spokespersons for saying we ought to have 46 Republicans uniting and voting against cloture on this bill to say: No, we are not going to let a partisan Democrat vote fund ObamaCare because we are not going to be complicit in any way, shape or form with destroying private health insurance and forcing Americans into socialized medicine.

Let me note that in the meantime, even for those who somewhat serenely say: Fear not; this is going to collapse on its own. The process will inevitably be painful. Just a few minutes ago I read a constituent from Euless, TX, who is disabled and on a fixed income, whose wife has retired and who has lost his insurance because of ObamaCare. There are millions of Americans in Kansas, in Kentucky, in Alabama and in St. Louis who over this country who are worried right now because their health insurance is in jeopardy. In my view the decision of some Members of the Senate to say: Well, let ObamaCare collapse—either on the Republican side because when it collapses it will all just magically go away, or on the Democratic side because when it collapses it will lead us all to the perfect utopia of socialized medicine—is easy. It is easy for Members of this body to say such things when they have cheap seats, similarly when the President has granted an exemption to Members of Congress from ObamaCare, where they feel that if the system collapses, if millions of Americans are suffering, it is not going to be us. It is not going to be our staff. The President has carved us out for special rules. It is just going to be the American people.

The most fundamental divide that is happening here is this body has stopped listening to the American people. We ought to have the urgency for this man and woman in Euless, TX, who is disabled and on a fixed income and retired and who wants to keep his health insurance, that we have for ourselves and our staffs. We ought to have that kind of urgency. And you know what. If it were our wife or our husband’s health insurance, we wouldn’t say: Let the system collapse because, in time, there will be a political victory. I guarantee if it were our spouse’s, if it were our daughter’s, if it were our son’s, if it were our child’s health insurance, particularly if they had significant health issues, not one of us would be serene in saying: Let it collapse, because we want to immunize ourselves from the criticism or because we want to ultimately move to socialized medicine.

I think the stakes have never been higher. In my view, the cloture vote we will take on either Friday or Saturday of this week is the most important vote that I will have taken—I think that any Member of the Senate will have taken—in the 9 months I have served in this body because it goes fundamentally to: Will we respond to the suffering ObamaCare is causing? Will we respond to the millions of people who are jobless? Will we respond to the people getting forced into part-time work? Will we respond to the people who are losing their health care or will we continue to say: For me but not for thee. Different rules apply to Washington that apply to the ruling class. The President can grant exemptions to the big corporations and to Members of Congress, but hardworking American families, you guys are left in the cold. I would suggest that is a fundamental abdication of our responsibility. We are here—or we should be here—fighting for the people.

Mr. SESSIONS, Madam President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CRUZ. I am happy to yield for a question without yielding the floor.

Mr. SESSIONS. By chance, or maybe because of the significance of it, my first question is very similar to what Senator CRUZ has just asked. Because I have given a lot of thought to this, I haven’t signed letters. I haven’t said how I was going to vote on this issue. But it was called to my attention that Senator Reid, the majority leader, flatly stated a month ago he believed in a single-payer system.

They asked him: Is it the Senator’s goal to move toward a single-payer system? And his answer is: yes, yes, absolutely yes.

I just left the Budget Committee hearing. We have a great team there, on the Republican and Democrat side, and my friend SHELDON WHITEHOUSE and I had a little exchange about the new health care law, and I thought he was suggesting it wasn’t much of a change. So I asked him this, I said: The majority leader said he favors a single-payer system. He said: I do too.

It wasn’t long ago in the Budget Committee that Senator BERNIE SANDERS made this argument. And Senator ROBERTS mentioned others. And of course the President did. I checked the President’s quote from 2003. He has denied it since, when he was trying to get the votes to pass the new law, but in 2003 he said he was a proponent of ‘‘a single-payer universal health system.’’

I think this is a huge national issue. This new health care law is clearly driven by an agenda: to have a single payer. So I ask Senator Cruz: If there is a single payer, who will the payer be?

Mr. CRUZ. The payer is always the government, which ultimately means the taxpayer, hardworking American families.

Mr. SESSIONS. In other words, the Federal Government?

Mr. CRUZ. I will continue to yield for a question without yielding the floor.

Mr. CRUZ. The Senator is absolutely correct. Once the government is paying for health care, it controls health care. That has proven to be the case in every country in the world.

I agree with the Senator from Alabama that it is commendable that there are some Members of this body who are openly embracing socialized medicine. That is commendable for candor. I don’t agree with it as a policy matter, but I actually think there is virtue to speaking honestly about what it is you support and not occupying the middle ground, as those—to take a quote from Theodore Roosevelt slightly out of context—cold, timid souls who know neither victory nor defeat.

One of the problems in this debate over ObamaCare is the relatively few who are candid about what ObamaCare is going to do. It is when the majority leader has, that Majority Leader R EID is not a passive observer from the sidelines. He is the man responsible, in his role as majority leader, for passing ObamaCare through this body with only Democratic votes—without a single Republican vote. So when he says it is designed to lead to a single-payer system, when he says it is designed to lead to socialized medicine, we should trust that he knows what he is talking about.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, if the Senator will yield again for a question.

Mr. CRUZ. I am happy to yield for a question without yielding the floor.

Mr. SESSIONS. And is it not true—since Senator Reid has made his position crystal clear ideologically, and based on the actions the Senator from Texas and I have observed—that he has steadfastly resisted any change whatever to the legislation as passed, certainly any change that would constrict its power and reach?

Mr. CRUZ. I think Senator Sessions is exactly correct.

If we look at the way this vote is set up, Republicans are being asked to vote with majority leader HARRY REID to shut off debate on this bill. Any Republican who votes yes on Friday or Saturday to invoke cloture will be voting alongside majority leader HARRY REID to give Leader Reid the authority to use the reconciliation procedure.

And his answer is: yes, yes, absolutely yes.

I will continue to yield for a question without yielding the floor.

Mr. CRUZ. The Senate is absolutely correct. Once the government is paying for health care, it controls health care. That has proven to be the case in every country in the world.

I agree with the Senator from Alabama that it is commendable that there are some Members of this body who are openly embracing socialized medicine. That is commendable for candor. I don’t agree with it as a policy matter, but I actually think there is virtue to speaking honestly about what it is you support and not occupying the middle ground, as those—to take a quote from Teddy Roosevelt slightly out of context—cold, timid souls who know neither victory nor defeat.

One of the problems in this debate over ObamaCare is the relatively few who are candid about what ObamaCare is going to do. It is when the majority leader has, that Majority Leader R EID is not a passive observer from the sidelines. He is the man responsible, in his role as majority leader, for passing ObamaCare through this body with only Democratic votes—without a single Republican vote. So when he says it is designed to lead to a single-payer system, when he says it is designed to lead to socialized medicine, we should trust that he knows what he is talking about.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, if the Senator will yield again for a question.

Mr. CRUZ. I am happy to yield for a question without yielding the floor.

Mr. SESSIONS. And is it not true—since Senator Reid has made his position crystal clear ideologically, and based on the actions the Senator from Texas and I have observed—that he has steadfastly resisted any change whatever to the legislation as passed, certainly any change that would constrict its power and reach?

Mr. CRUZ. I think Senator Sessions is exactly correct.

If we look at the way this vote is set up, Republicans are being asked to vote with majority leader HARRY REID to shut off debate on this bill. Any Republican who votes yes on Friday or Saturday to invoke cloture will be voting alongside majority leader HARRY REID to give Leader Reid the authority to use the reconciliation procedure.
At the same time the majority leader has made clear he is not going to allow other amendments. He is not going to allow amendments that would improve ObamaCare or fix ObamaCare. He is not going to allow the amendment of Senator Vitter, his anti-lawsuit class, who are going to allow the amendment of Senator Reid, that would correct or get rid of the congressional exemption and treat Members of Congress the same as the American people, get rid of President Obama’s lawless exemption, and stop treating Members of Congress like a privileged ruling class who are different from the American people. Leader Reid has said he is not going to allow a vote on that, not going to allow a vote on repealing the medical devices tax that has been crippling the medical devices industry, and that is killing innovation and killing jobs.

If Republicans are complicit in shutting off debate and allowing just a single vote on funding ObamaCare, then we have only ourselves to blame. If we give the majority leader the power to do that we cannot be surprised when he exercises it. It is within the power of the 46 Republicans in this body to say no, to say: No, we will not shut off debate that allows the majority leader to use 51 votes to fund ObamaCare on a straight party-line party in the Democratic vote. We will not be complicit in a process that treats Members of Congress like a privileged ruling class and that ignores the cries for help from the American people. All we have to do to accomplish that is for Republicans to stand together and stand united.

It is my hope, my fervent hope, that the voices of dissenion within the Republican conference will stop firing at each other and start firing at the target. And let me be clear who is the target. It is the Democrats. It is not us. Let us not want us to start firing at Democrats or at the President or at anyone else. It is not about us. The target is ObamaCare. It is fixing this train wreck that is hurting the American people.

If Members of the Republican conference in the Senate could devote one-tenth of the ferocity they have devoted to fighting within the caucus on this issue, to actually stopping ObamaCare—not a symbolic vote, not a press release, not a speech, but actually fixing the problem—I could think of nothing better this Senate could do.

And you know what. If, instead of 100 Senators, this Chamber had 100 citizens picked from our States at random, I guarantee not a one of them would say in discussing this: You know what we need is a bunch of symbolic votes. They wouldn’t say that. Regular people who live on planet Earth would know a symbolic vote is not a good thing or bad thing. They would say, if we grabbed any hundred—and I wouldn’t even have a partisan screen on it. I would at random—100 regular people—I guarantee you they would say: We have to fix ObamaCare. This thing is hurting people.

The problem is too many Members of this body are not listening, and we need to make DC listen.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, without yielding the floor, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. CRUZ. I yield for a question without yielding the floor.

Mr. SESSIONS. I notice a real low number of jobs being created this year. And the reports were that 77 percent of those jobs created this year were part-time, not full-time jobs: Allan Meltzer, one of the great economists in the last 50 years, a knowledgeable observer of our economy, just testified in a Budget Committee hearing in this body to say that ObamaCare was a factor in that occurring.

Would the Senator agree that we have had this extraordinary increase in part-time jobs rather than full-time jobs, and that is hammering working Americans who need full-time work?

Mr. CRUZ. Senator Sessions is absolutely right. One of the most devastating consequences of ObamaCare is that it is forcing so many Americans into part-time work. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce’s quarterly small business survey found that among small businesses that will be impacted by the employer mandate, 50 percent of small businesses say they will either cut out to reduce full-time employees or replace full-time employees with part-time employees to avoid the mandate, and 24 percent say they will reduce hiring to stay under 50 employees. As Senator Sessions knows, this is not one isolated anecdote here or there. According to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, this is 50 percent of small businesses reducing employees’ hours forcibly or just hiring part-time employees instead. This is an enormous problem. Who gets hurt? When someone gets their hours reduced to 29 hours a week, it is usually not the lawyers. It is usually not the professionals. It is absolutely never Senators and Members of Congress.

This is destroying people’s lives. This is not just about baking a cake or selling boats. This is people whose hours get forcibly reduced are almost always, without exception, the vulnerable among us. They are the young, they are the Hispanics, the African Americans, the single mom working in a diner, struggling to feed her kids, to be a good example to her kids, who suddenly finds instead of having one job where she works her fingers to the bone to take care of her kids, she has to get two because 29 hours a week is not enough to provide for her kids. Suddenly she has two jobs, both at 29 hours a week. She has to commute from one to the other. She has to deal with two bosses. Boss No. 1 says: I want you at work Tuesday morning. Boss No. 2 says: I want you at work Tuesday morning. What is a single mom supposed to do? What is a single mom supposed to do?

Mr. CRUZ. The Senator from Alabama is absolutely correct. One of the disturbing trends we have seen in recent years is the boom growth in our economy is government. There are lots of consequences to that; one is that the best and the brightest learn, hey, you want to have success, go into government. The private sector is really where it is, the bright and the best. This is a tragedy playing out across this country, and it is incumbent on this body to listen to the people. We need to make DC listen.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, will the Senator yield for a question without yielding the floor?

Mr. CRUZ. I will yield for a question without yielding the floor.

Mr. SESSIONS. I know the Senator is aware that the number of people employed in the workforce today has fallen to the lowest level since 1975 and workers have declined. We have learned today in our Budget Committee hearing we have had a surge from around 300,000 people working part-time to 1 million. These are bad trends, but one place that has avoided that; that is, the Washington, DC, area. It has had more job growth, higher income job growth than any place in America.

If this bill becomes entrenched into law, will it not create a huge additional increase of workers and bureaucrats in and around this city, all riding on the backs of American workers?

Mr. CRUZ. The Senator from Alabama is absolutely correct. One of the reasons that Senator Vitter’s amendment would say that Members of Congress shall be subject to the same rules as the American people and not have the special exemption President Obama has put in place is so important and why I support an even broader amendment that would include all Federal employees on the ObamaCare exchanges.

Our friends on the Democratic side of the aisle routinely say ObamaCare is terrific. It is great. If that is the case, then they should be excited about being on those exchanges, which are apparently so great for our constituents, and so should Federal workers. But they are not, indeed, as the Senator from Alabama knows.

This issue has caused more consternation among Members and congressional staff than probably any
Is that the way the Senator sees the situation we are in today?

Mr. CRUZ. Senator SESSIONS is absolutely correct. I would note, first of all, the Senate Democrat who is the lead author of ObamaCare has referred to ObamaCare as “the major train wreck.” That is not I speaking. That is not Senator SESSIONS speaking. That is the lead author of ObamaCare, a Democratic Senator.

I commend his candor. It is indeed a major train wreck. I have no doubt that more than a few of his colleagues on that side of the aisle were unhappy with him for speaking the truth on that.

There should be a lot more truth-speaking in this body, not engaging in partisan team politics but speaking the truth for the American people. That was commendable for Senator BAUCUS to speak for the American people and say this is a major train wreck. We need to all acknowledge it is a major train wreck. Let’s step forward to avert the train wreck.

Senator SESSIONS’ second point is a very important one. I note Senator SESSIONS is an elder statesman in this body, has served admirably a great number of Members of Congress and their staff are exasperated with the Senate Democrat who is the lead author of ObamaCare, and we can’t offer amendments, so the other 99 Senators are muzzled, we can’t offer amendments to improve ObamaCare, we can’t offer amendments to fix ObamaCare, and we can’t offer amendments to do anything. Indeed, the more liberal Members of the Senate Democratic caucus can’t offer amendments to adopt a single-payer socialized medicine system, which some of them openly embrace. That is a sign of a Senate that is not working.

There should be open debate and there should be open amendments. One of the great strengths of this body is that all 100 Senators for most of the history of the Republic could offer any amendments, and the other 99 Senators are muzzled, we can’t offer amendments to improve ObamaCare, and we can’t offer amendments to do anything. Indeed, the more liberal Members of the Senate Democratic caucus can’t offer amendments to adopt a single-payer socialized medicine system, which some of them openly embrace. That is a sign of a Senate that is not working.

For folks who are at home watching this debate, it is easy to let the procedure make your eyes glaze over. When you hear someone take about invoking cloture on the motion to proceed, it is utterly incomprehensible to virtually anyone in the country. Indeed, I suspect more than a few people on the floor of the Senate right now don’t quite understand what it means.

But what is all this procedure about? Why should you care about filling the tree? You should care about it because it is a tool of power, of silencing the people, and using the positions of power to enforce Washington’s ideological positions on the rest of the country.

If we got out of Washington, DC, if we went to the American people and said what are your top priorities—we actually have. We don’t have to hypothesize about that. The American people over and over again say jobs and the economy are their top priorities. The American people want ObamaCare stopped because it is not working, it is killing jobs, it is pushing people into part-time work. Yet this Senate has not been listening to the American people.

We need to make DC listen.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CRUZ. I am happy to yield for a question without yielding the floor.

Mr. SESSIONS. I would also observe, the Senator probably is aware, it does appear there is a budget point of order against this whole continuing resolution. I want to mention a couple of things.

I want to thank the Senator for having the courage to stand here and raise the concerns I am hearing all over my State. I had three separate meetings in August, as I traveled the State, with small business groups. It is difficult to overstate the concerns they have with this law. They tell me without a doubt it is impacting their willingness to hire and the uncertainty in the workplace is damaging business in America, and this is particularly true in my State.

They are struggling to get by. They are laying off people and they are not happy about it. They say this law alone is the primary thing that is hammering them in this country. I have given a lot of thought to it. I am beginning to see that we have to use the opportunities we have to confront this issue and talk about it and try to force some changes and improvements.

I appreciate the effort, and I am going to support the Senator. I am going to oppose any advancing of the final bill that does not provide some change in ObamaCare.

I did not sign the letter, and have some great friends who see it differently than I do who likewise are totally opposed to the health care law. I want to be sure people who are listening need to know good people, I think, can disagree on this. But the Senator stood up and raised the question and forced us to confront it and talk about it and I am going to support him. I am not going to vote to move a bill where we are sure we are going to be blocked from having any
meaningful discussion on one of the most historic, damaging laws in maybe the last hundred years that would basically move us to single-payer, government-run socialized medicine. I think that is where we are heading.

I thank the Senator for his leadership. Hopefully we can begin to force this Senate to act. The House has already acted. They have repeatedly acted to fix this legislation, because it is so damaging. But the Senate, the Democratic Senate, refuses to act. It refuses to listen. That is the problem I have. One way I have to express that is to support the position the Senator has taken.

I thank him very much and wish him good luck.

Mr. CRUZ. I thank the Senator from Alabama for his question and fundamentally for his support. His support is very needed. Senator Sessions is a man who is respected in this body. He commands the respect of his peers.

If you read the newspapers, the votes have already been decided. If you watch the TV commentators, I read one newspaper article—"it was actually styled a news article—that talked about the "effort to defund ObamaCare, which is doomed to fail."

That was the lead, the opening line of what purported to be an objective news article. A lot of folks in official Washington and the Washington establishment have said there is no way this can happen.

Three weeks ago they said there is no way the House is going to vote to defund ObamaCare. Three weeks ago you read it was impossible, cannot happen, will not happen. Yet on Friday the House voted overwhelmingly to defund ObamaCare.

This week it is all the same pundits. A funny thing: Everyone who said it is impossible in the House—apparently there are no consequences for their being proved laughingly, totally, completely wrong. And they all come out with the same story, the same baritone voices, to say it is impossible that the votes will be there in the Senate. Republicans will not stand together.

Let me point to just a minute ago. Senator JEFF SESSIONS who, as he knows, was not on the letter the Senator MIKE LEE circulated, was not initially part of the group—according to all of the press, anyone who was not on the letter was necessarily going to oppose us, and Jeff Sessions is here, courageously standing, and I appreciate his leadership, his principle, and his courage. I am going to suggest this debate is having exactly the function it is supposed to have.

Back when this body was in fact the world’s greatest deliberative body, as it was reputed to be, debates were about moving hearts and minds and making the case. How can we best serve the American people? Now, sadly, debates usually occur in an empty Chamber and the Washington establishment tells us this is the result of the vote before it happens.

Let me note for those of you keeping score at home, the momentum has consistently been in favor of defunding ObamaCare. Two months ago everyone said it was impossible, the American people were not behind it, the House was not behind it, the Senate was not behind it. We saw the American people unite. We saw over 1.6 million Americans sign a national petition, we saw the House unite, and now the Senate must unite, and I am grateful to Senator Sessions for his leadership.

Mr. RUBIO. I thank the Senator for his efforts here today and in the weeks that led us here. I ask the Senator from Texas—let me preface this by saying so much of the focus—if you read the coverage, all the focus is on what is going to happen, the process, the votes, who is going to vote what. I think that is important and I think we will have a conversation about that in the moments to come. What is the most enthusiastic about in the last few hours is there is an increasing focus on why. Why are people so passionate about ObamaCare, particularly those who are opposed to it? Why is there a growing number of Americans saying please don’t continue to fund ObamaCare is a bad idea? Why are Republicans united against ObamaCare?

Let’s be clear. We do have a tactical debate going on in the Republican Party about the right way to stop ObamaCare. What I am most enthusiastic about among Republicans is this is a bad idea for the country. Why are we so passionate about that? I only speak for myself in what I am about to say, and I think it speaks for others. I will ask the Senator from Texas to comment in a moment about that. I think sometimes when you are born and raised, as I have been, your whole life in this country, speaking for myself, sometimes it is easy to take for granted how special this is all for you have known. This is all we have ever been around so we take that for granted a little bit.

I had a blessing, similar to the same one the Senator from Texas had. I actually grew up around people who knew what life was like somewhere else. They knew what America had is special because they lived somewhere else and they knew what the world was like outside of America. It is a reminder of how much impact and how special from the rest of the world is that it is one of the few places in human history where no matter where you start out in life, no matter how poor you were, no matter how poor your parents were, no matter how disconnected they may be from power, if you are willing to work hard and you are willing to sacrifice, you can have a better life.

For us Americans, that seems, of course, right. That is why we have always been a nation that that means for a moment. Imagine for a second that that is not the case. Imagine for a second if you are someone with talent and dreams and aspirations and ambitions but knowing that in the society you live in, the society you are from the right people, you are not from the right family. You don’t come from the right family. Imagine how frustrating that must be.

That is the story of humanity up until about 200 years ago when the American experiment began, based on something very powerful the Senator from Texas talked about a moment ago, the idea that every single one of us has a God-given right to go as far as our talent and our work will take us. That is the story of humanity in all of human history. I point out that today because I remember growing up knowing my parents wanted me to clearly understand that I would have a chance to do things they had a chance to do because I lived in an extraordinary place unlike any that had ever existed before.

Fast forward to today and the challenges we face as a country. The one thing that most worries me as I analyze American politics and the state of our country is there is a growing number of people who are starting to doubt whether that dream is still true; a growing number of people who are starting to wonder is it still true that if you work hard and you sacrifice, you can get ahead. Do you know why they are doubting that? Because they are working hard, they are working harder than they ever have, they are sacrificing, and not only are they not getting the rewards, they are struggling to keep from falling behind.

There are a lot of reasons why this is happening. Globalization has changed the nature of our economy. So have advances in information technology. We have an emerging skills gap in this country where unfortunately many Americans have not acquired the skills needed for these new jobs in the 21st century. We have to address these things. Societal breakdown is real. It is destroying American politics and it is one of the leading causes of poverty in the United States, and that is troubling too.

But for those of us who are in the Federal Government and in the policy-making branch of government, I think it is time we realize that one of the leading threats to the American dream is the policies that are being pursued at the Federal level, policies that are undermining the free enterprise system. Here is why that is important—she says, this is the only economic system in human history that rewards hard work, sacrifice, and merit is the American free enterprise
system. The evidence is all over the world. Look all over the world at people whose families have lived in poverty for generations, who now have joined the middle class. They live in countries that are trying to copy the American economic model. They don’t have economies that combine socialism, they don’t live in countries that embrace big government. They live in places that are trying to move toward free enterprise. Free enterprise has eradicated more poverty than all the government programs combined. That is the story of free enterprise. That is why it is startling that over the last few decades, Federal policies have contributed steadily to undermining the free enterprise system.

We talk about all those policies, but ObamaCare is an example of that. You ask yourself how does ObamaCare undermine the free enterprise system? There are a few examples. First, because as businesses and individuals created by ObamaCare, there are thousands of middle-class jobs that will not be created. These are jobs that were going to be created that someone wanted to create. I met a restaurant owner. I think he was from Louisiana. He testified before the Small Business Committee. He wants to open new restaurants. He has specific sites in mind. He knows he can make it work. He is not going to do it and he cites ObamaCare as the reason why. These are jobs that were going to be created that do not now exist because of ObamaCare. That undermines the free enterprise system.

ObamaCare has a mandate. It has already been discussed here on the floor. It says if you have more than 50 full-time workers, you have to live by a bunch of mandates that it creates. Do you know what the result of that has been? Businesses close to that number are deciding I don’t want to have 50 employees. I want to have 48 or 49 so that doesn’t apply to me because I can’t afford for it to apply to me. Do you know what that means? That means those were jobs that were going to be created or those are jobs that were there but now they are part time. That means you lost money out of your paycheck.

It also has redefined what part-time work is. An American economic reality is that part-time work is anything less than 40 hours, except for ObamaCare, anything less than 30 hours. So what is happening? People working part time are losing their hours.

Real world example. Sea World in Florida just announced it is moving over 2,000 of its part-time employees from 32 hours a week to 28 hours a week. That is not just a statistic. These are people who are losing 4 hours’ worth of pay a week.

The irony is that this bill is supposed to be helping, the working class and middle class—the people who are trying to get ahead—are the people it is directly hurting. That is just one example. There are multiple examples. Senator Cruz and I could cite examples all night of real people who will be hurt in this way.

I have one more point that has not been talked about. I mean true. Medicare Advantage is a program that gives seniors choices. It has competition. There are different companies that provide Medicare Advantage benefits, and they compete for the business of seniors by offering additional benefits. My mother is a Medicare Advantage recipient. She is heavily marketed every year because—all seniors are in that area—they want her business. How do they compete? They offer transportation, free pharmaceuticals, or whatever it may be. Well, guess what. ObamaCare takes money out of Medicare Advantage, not to save Medicare but to fund ObamaCare. Later this year—in early January—these seniors are going to get a letter in the mail saying Medicare Advantage plans no longer offers X, Y, or whatever some of these benefits are. That is just another example of who is hurt by this.

Why are we passionate? Why are we here about this? Look, we have an ideological problem with government being involved in such a widespread way in health care, but now it is beyond that. We are passionate about this opportunity that we have to stop ObamaCare because of the impact this has on real people. At the end of the day, that is what we are fighting for. We are not fighting against ObamaCare, and we are fighting for these people.

By the way, the people we are fighting for includes people who voted for the President. This includes, by the way, people who didn’t vote for me or the Senator from Texas or the Senator from Utah. We are fighting for them because they are going to be hurt by this.

If your dream is to open your own business one day and to grow it, ObamaCare will hurt you. It is going to make it harder for you to be able to do that. If your dream is to do what my parents did, which is to work a job so your kids could one day have a career, ObamaCare is hurting you too. It could cost you the insurance you have now that you are happy with. It could cost you hours out of your paycheck. It could cost you your very job. What is the point of working part time while you go to school at night? If you are paying your way through school as a part-time worker, ObamaCare is going to hurt you. You are going to lose hours at work potentially because of ObamaCare. What if you graduated from college? You finished college and have done everything that has been asked of you.

What do we tell young people in America who go to school, get good grades, a degree, and dream of having a career and better life? What do they want to do? They want to graduate from college, get married, buy a house, and start a family. A lot of people are having to put that off for a lot of reasons. ObamaCare will be one of the reasons. You know why? Because that job or career you wanted to start may not be created now because of ObamaCare.

What if you worked your whole life—like the 3 million seniors who live in Florida—and are living with dignity, security and stability, and can finally sign up for the Medicare Advantage plan, but now ObamaCare is hurting you? That is the irony in all of this. The very people they said this plan—this bill, this idea—would help are the very people it is hurting the most.

That, by the way, is the experience of big government.

I know that big government sounds appealing sometimes when you are hurting and struggling to make ends meet and then a politician comes along and says: I’m going to create a new program called jobs for Americans and health care for everybody. When you are struggling, this stuff sounds enticing. The problem is it never works. Anytime and anywhere it has been tried, it has failed, and it will fail again. It doesn’t work.

In fact, big government hurts the people who are trying to make it. If you are a multimillion-dollar corporation or a millionaire or billionaire, you may not like big government, but you can afford to deal with it. If you are a major corporation in America, you can hire the best lawyers in America to navigate whatever complex nut the government throws at you. If you really don’t like it, you can hire the best lobbyist in this city to write the laws in your favor or try to get them written in your favor.

However, if you are trying to start a business by using the free wi-fi at Starbucks or you are using the spare bedroom in your home to start a business, you can’t navigate all of that big government stuff. You can’t afford to hire a lobbyist to get a waiver from ObamaCare. That is the irony of this. The very people that government promises to help are the people it hurts the most, and we are seeing it again with ObamaCare.

Who is getting waivers from ObamaCare? The people who can afford to influence it. That is the experience of big government. It is the experience of ObamaCare. That is just not fair. It is not fair that in America the people who are willing to work hard and sacrifice are not able to achieve a better life. That is wrong.

The only way to assure that those opportunities are there is to embrace the free enterprise system, not to undermine it or try to replace it with an expansion of government that in the end will collapse under its own weight. But that is the direction we are headed in right now.

You want to know what the biggest issue facing America politically is? It
is not whether Republicans or Democrats win the next election, it is whether we will continue to be an exceptional country where anyone from anywhere can accomplish anything or whether we will become like the rest of the world. No power is a country with a big economy, but no longer the place where hard work and sacrifice is enough. That is the choice we are being asked to make on issue after issue that comes before this body, and this one.

I will yield back to the Senator from Texas by just saying this: My parents were never rich. I told this story before, but I tell it, not so much to talk about me, but to talk about us, because this is our story, not just mine. My parents were never rich. When they came here, they didn’t know anybody. They had no money or connections. They barely spoke the language. When they first opened a hotel, they were discouraged. They wondered if they made a mistake. Sometimes they thought that maybe they should have stayed back in Cuba. Ultimately, they persevered and hung in there.

Ten years after they had been here, my dad was working as a bartender and my mom worked as a maid and a cashier. They bought their first home in 1966. In fact, by 1971, they were so optimistic about the future, that after both of them were over 40 years of age, they had me, and then my sister a year and a half after that. Talk about optimistic about the future. America fundamentally changed their lives because of free enterprise.

My dad had a job at those hotels because someone had access to money and risked it. They took a risk and said: I am going to invest this money into this hotel because I believe in my idea. Because someone took a risk, my dad and my mom had a job. They weren’t rich. We never owned multiple homes. We never had a yacht. We never traveled to Europe. There is nothing wrong with any of those things.

My parents lived the American dream. Why? Because they lived a life no one in their family history had ever lived in terms of stability and security, and they were able to provide opportunities for their children they themselves never had. That is the American dream. It is about being able to fulfill your God-given potential, whatever it may be, and it is what is at play right now.

There are millions of people in this country who are trying to achieve their American dream. There are millions of people across America who are trying to achieve what my parents were able to do for me and what Senator Cruz’s parents were able to do for him. Our job is to make it easier for them to do it, not harder. Our job is to do everything we can to ensure that this is the one country on Earth where that is still possible.

When we pass bills such as ObamaCare, which claims to help people like this, we are not helping them. We are hurting them. If we hurt them, we hurt the country because there cannot be an America without an American dream. We can’t be special and exceptional without the American dream, and that is what is being undermined by the voter(named) ObamaCare.

At the end of the day that is why we are so passionate about this, and that is why this is an issue worth fighting for.

The Senator from Texas was reading stories and cases earlier today that he heard from around the country, and that is what these people are telling us. That is what they are saying to us. They are saying: All we want is a chance to turn our dreams into reality. All we want is a chance to be able to work hard and sacrifice so we can achieve a better life. All we want is for you guys to give us a chance.

I ask the Senator from Texas: Isn’t that what the issue is all about? Isn’t that what the issue is all about? Mr. CRUZ. The chances we value Senator from Florida is absolutely correct. I agree entirely. Senator Rubio is inspiring. Senator Marco Rubio is a critical national leader. When Senator Mike Lee began this fight, Marco Rubio was right there from the beginning, despite the protests and despite official Washington saying that he should know better than to stand against the DC establishment and stand for the people.

I don’t think if there is anyone more effective, more articulate, or a more persuasive voice for conservative principles than my friend Marco Rubio. His race in Florida 2 years ago was supposed to be impossible. I know that because I read it in the paper over and over.

Actually, many of the same people are saying this fight is impossible. They all said it with that same certainty and that same deep baritone voice. They said there is no chance of winning this race. If it were up to official Washington, they would have been right. By every measure of official Washington, the winner of that race that would have been picked was the governor of the State. All of Washington was behind him. The only thing that was standing with Marco Rubio was the people.

When he started, he was at 3 percent in the polls. That is a condition I know well because I found myself in a similar position. Yet he ran a campaign where he crisscrossed the State of Florida. He listened to the Florida people and got support from the grassroots. His victory in 2010 was a transformational moment in American politics, and it is also emblematic about what this fight is about right here.

If you trust the talking heads on television, if you trust the reporters who tell us what is up and what is down, what is white and what is black, then ObamaCare is here to stay and America has to continue to suffer with it because we can never, ever do anything to change it. As long as this body, the Senate, believes the opinions of these 100 people in this room is more important than the American people, that will remain a true and accurate description. But that is not our job. Our job is to listen to the people.

Marco Rubio’s parents were Cuban immigrants. His dad was a bartender. It was a family experience that resonates powerfully with me because I came from a similar background. But more important than that, Marco Rubio’s story is our story. There is not a Member of this Senate, or a person in this country, who doesn’t have a story just like that somewhere in their background.

The most unique aspect of the United States of America, I believe, is that we are all the children of those who risked everything for freedom. I think it is the most fundamental aspect of our DNA and what it means to be an American. What unifies all of us is that as a nation we value liberty and opportunity above all else.

One of the things I admire about Senator Rubio is how he views issues in this Senate. He doesn’t look at it from how it impacts the titans of industry, the CEOs, the titans of industry. It impacts people such as his dad and my dad, the people who struggled and climbed the economic ladder, seeking the American dream.

If today you are a bartender at a Nevada hotel or if you are washing dishes at a restaurant, like his father and my father, respectively, ObamaCare is hurting you. It is hurting you in a way that all the Senators who have a special exemption from Barack Obama don’t have to worry about. It is hurting you because your job is in jeopardy. You may well lose your job or you may not have a job to begin with.

Maybe you would like to be a bartender or wash dishes, but because of ObamaCare, there is no job for you. Maybe it is hurting you because what used to be a 40-hour a week job has become a 29-hour a week job and your boss has told you: I don’t have any choice. ObamaCare kicks in at 30 hours a week, and it will bankrupt me.

Suddenly you are struggling by either working 29 hours a week and are unable to feed your kids or have to get a second job and work 29 hours a week and have to juggle your schedule, which results in making your life more difficult than it need not to mention your concerns about health insurance. Maybe you have a health insurance.

Maybe a person has a health insurance plan they have been struggling to pay, but it is important to them and they want to make sure their kids are covered, they want to make sure their spouse is covered. Yet every year they see their premiums going up and up and up.

We remember when President Obama was defending the ObamaCare bill. He promised the American people that as a result of ObamaCare, the average
family’s health insurance premium would drop $2,500. He said: That is going to happen by the end of my first term. I would point out that the President’s first term ended 9 months ago, and by the end of the President’s first term, that promise has proven not just a little bit too much, not just kind of a little bit not entirely accurate; it was proven 100 percent, categorically, objectively false.

Let me suggest to every American, if your health insurance premiums have dropped, the President promised the average family—so there would be tens of millions for whom that is true—then I would encourage those Americans to enthusiastically stand and defend ObamaCare. But there is a reason it is so profoundly unpopular, and it is because it hasn’t happened. Premiums have gone up, and the American people are hurting as a result. So DC should listen to the people. We should make DC listen.

Mr. LEE. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CRUZ. I am happy to yield for a question without yielding the floor.

Mr. LEE. I wish to ask the Senator from Texas whether he has received comments as to those I have received from my constituents and from other concerned citizens from around the country in recent months. I wish to highlight a few and ask whether these are similar to comments the Senator from Texas has heard, concerns he has heard expressed.

Let me start by sharing one expressed by Shawn from Utah, who says:

I do not like the fact that the President is picking winners and picking and choosing which parts of the law he will enforce. We need the three branches of government to keep freedom alive.

Well, Shawn from Utah, I share your concern. I would add to that, to Shawn from Texas, that this is really what started this effort. In other words, during the first week of July 2013, when the President announced there were several provisions in the law he simply would not be implementing, he simply would not be enforcing, along the lines of what Congress enacted with the Affordable Care Act in 2010, it was at that point that I and several others put our heads together and realized that if the President is saying this law is not ready to implement, if this law objectively is not ready to implement; if, as we now understand it, the law is going to make health care less affordable rather than more affordable for so many Americans, perhaps Congress shouldn’t be funding its implementation and enforcement. Perhaps that ought to be telling us something.

So it is important to remember, as Shawn from Utah points out to us, that we do have three branches of government. That is the legislative branch. Our job is to make the laws. The President does not have law-making authority. The President can seek changes in the law just as other citizens can seek them from Congress, but Congress does have to act.

Although the President wields the veto pen, the veto pen is not the legislation pen. He doesn’t have the power to legislate on his own without the ascertainment, the participation, a portfolio and the reasons we are in this debate today. It is one of the reasons we have, along with so many millions of Americans, expressed this position that we would like to fund government while defunding ObamaCare. Perhaps that is something the American people are calling out for. It is something they are requesting. It is something the House of Representatives acted boldly and bravely in doing, in standing behind the American people. This really is what we are doing. This is the whole reason we are concerned about this, because we want to stand with the American people and with the House leadership, Speaker Boehner and the other leaders in the other body in Congress, who have bravely put forward this legislation to keep government funded while defunding ObamaCare.

One of the things we have been concerned about today and one of the things I think we need to focus on in the next few days is the fact that with the House of Representatives acting last week, passing this legislation, this continuing resolution to keep government funded while defunding ObamaCare, in order for us to stand behind the American people and defend a law that they have, what we are entitled to instead of protecting a free people paving our own path. Government gets bigger while the job market is getting crushed. I work for a company that is getting crushed. I work for a company in the middle of layoffs and more are to follow. We can’t continue on like that.

This is an acknowledgment that so many people across our great country are making as they discover the impact of this bill—passed into law some 3½ years ago—that has not increased in popularity over the last few years.

Time might not have increased its popularity—in fact, it has had quite the opposite effect—but time has had the effect of expanding its volume. It has grown from 2,700 pages when it was passed to more than 20,000 pages now when we add the implementing regulations. That is quite stunning. The length of it is quite stunning. It reminds me of something James Madison wrote—I believe it was in Federalist No. 62. He said, if I may paraphrase him, it will be of little benefit to the American people that their laws may be written by individuals of their own choosing if those laws are so voluminous and complex that they can’t reasonably be read and understood by the American people. Well, 2,700 pages is a little too long. It is a lot too long. And I certainly know that 20,000 pages is much too too much too long.

That brings to mind a comment I received from Marcia, also from Utah, who writes this:
However well intentioned Obama care may be, I do not feel this is the best solution. I think something “less wordy” and more succinct would be a much better plan. If you can’t make it less than 5 pages or less, it may not work. The changes already enacted have made it more difficult for me to get medical care. Not a big help!

Well said, Marcia, very well said.

While we vote on legislation people haven’t read, the American people tend to suffer. When we perpetuate a mistake once made embodied in a 2,700-page bill, things go from bad to worse to much, much worse.

We have an opportunity now is an opportunity for us to debate and discuss the merits of something that perhaps was not adequately debated and discussed 3 years ago when this law was passed, when Members of Congress were told to pass this law to find out what is in it. We well, we know a lot more about what is in it now. The American people have concerns.

It is appropriate to have the discussion now in connection with spending legislation before us, after all. Congress does have the power of the purse. Congress is given this power, this responsibility of making decisions regarding taxing and spending. It was for this reason the founding generation wisely put it in the hands of the House of Representatives—the power of the purse—giving the House of Representatives the responsibility to initiate or originate bills relating to this power. It is the House of Representatives that is, after all, a part of a government and of Congress that is most directly responsive to the needs of the people.

It is appropriate that we have this discussion regarding funding or not funding a piece of legislation that is going to require a lot of money and is going to be proven costly to the American people in many, many ways in the coming years—I say “costly in many ways” to reflect the fact that it is not just the cost of government money; it costs people all sorts of things as well. It is costing them jobs. It is costing them wages. It is costing them health. It is costing them access to health care in many circumstances.

Let me read something I received from Randy. Randy is from my neighboring State of Idaho. Randy writes:

My wife and I have a small business with about 20 employees. We struggle to stay in business. We feel that if and when Obama care is implemented, we will not be able to continue to be in business.

Randy, I can’t tell you how many people I have heard make very similar comments from one end of my State of Utah to the other and from people across America. You are not alone, Randy. A lot of people out there are concerned as well.

That is one thing people lose in addition to wages or jobs or access to health care—some of them lose the opportunity they have to stay in business, the opportunity of talking about middle-class aires and billionaires; we are talking about hard-working Americans who put a lot on the line in order to make a decent living, in order to provide jobs for their few employees. This is something we need to look out for. This is something we may not, we must not lightly brush aside.

Here is something else some Americans will sometimes say: If that was the case, they were surprised. They would not lose access to a doctor they like; access to a doctor they have come to trust over the years.

This one comes from Jack of the State of Texas. Jack says:

My family and I are talking about an early retirement because of polices Obamacare is going to require him to follow that will compromise the oath he took when he became an M.D.

This is a sad, Jack. This is something we were promised would not happen, and it is something that should not happen. This is something that we are told is happening from time to time.

Ryan, also from Texas, writes:

My mother is a middle-class mortician whose health care costs are going up by 68 percent for this poorly envisioned law with no other changes. She simply cannot afford to maintain health care coverage without significant changes to her lifestyle, and for what?

Sometimes we have to ask that question: And for what?

Sometimes we have to ask the question, the same question that physicians are required to ask themselves: Are we doing harm? It is my understanding that when a physician becomes licensed, he or she must take an oath, an oath that involves an obligation to first do no harm. We as lawmakers have to ask ourselves that question from time to time. We as lawmakers have to view ourselves as subject to a similar obligation to first do no harm.

(Mr. DONELLY assumed the chair.)

Some have said that when you are carrying around a hammer, everything starts to look like a nail. I wonder whether that is sometimes true of Congress and the law-making power. Because of the law-making power we wield, sometimes, when we view problems, we assume we automatically, necessarily, inevitably have the right solutions. Well, in some cases that may be true. In other cases, it might be true in part. But that power might be used incorrectly. Sometimes when legislation is hastily drafted, thrown together in a hurry, rather than for purposes of making sure it is part of a cohesive whole—something that will be a coherent mechanism that can be implemented in a commonsense fashion—sometimes if it is thrown together too hastily and these cautions are ignored, doing harm is my understanding, we can find ourselves first doing harm above all else, and that is not OK.

When we look at this law, and we look at the fact that the American people are funding its implementation, we discover it is much deeper than something that was a legislative mandate or an employer mandate or a set of regulations governing the insurance industry. It is much more than that. It is much more than what people will have to do with regard to the reporting of some fairly personal details about their lives to the IRS, an agency that Americans have come to trust substantially less than they already did, that was supposed to be in place.

It is about the fact that the American people—in addition to being made less free by this law, and in addition to being made less prosperous by this law—are also required to fund its implementation and all the enforcement against them. That is where the power of the purse must come into play. That is what makes it so appropriate, so essential, so vital that we have this discussion right here and right now as we consider spending legislation, spending legislation that may well represent our last best hope of achieving a degree of delay or defunding of this legislation before its primary operative provisions take full effect. That is why it is important for us to have this discussion right now.

Let me emphasize again the importance of the cloture vote and the position we are taking on that. It is grounded fundamentally in the understanding that the House of Representatives acted in a manner that was inconsistent with what the American people have been asking. I cannot emphasize enough the fact that House Speaker JOHN BOEINER and his leadership team in the House—nay, this House of Representatives—have supported him in this effort. They got great work. They stood valiantly with the American people who were calling out overwhelmingly for them to take this step, to keep government funded but defund Obamacare. And that is what they did.

Now that they have acted, there are two approaches we could take to this that are perfectly appropriate. We could vote on that legislation as is, up or down, or we could subject it to an amendment process, allow Democrats and Republicans alike to present amendments to make the House-passed resolution better, as they might deem fit. We can debate and discuss and vote on each of those. Sure, it can be time-consuming. Sure, it can be grueling. But that is our job. We took an oath to do that job. We do this all the time—maybe not as much as we should. But a few months ago in connection with the budget resolution, we as Senators stood and sat—a little of both—here all night long. We voted day and night until 5 o’clock in the morning. People got a little cranky at times, but that is what we are here to do—not to be cranky, but we are here to vote, to cast votes on amendments. That is what we did that day because there were a lot of amendments. That is what we should be doing with this if, in fact, we decide we want amendments to the House-passed resolution.

So vote on it up or down as is; fine. Subject it to an open amendment process; fine. Trying to do it both ways, the majority leader telling us this will be subject to one amendment, one amendment only—an amendment that
would gut and render nugatory the op-erative provision that was so impor-tant to so many House Members—that is not OK. That is why those who agree with us on this point, those who feel that way, those who feel the American people are counting on us to stand up for them, should vote no on cloture and have a vote to the cloture vote on the bill later in this week.

I would ask my colleague from Texas, as to these concerns I have expressed, these that have been made from people around the country—some of them my constituents in Utah, some of them from other parts of the country, including a couple from Texas—what similarities does the Senator see between these statements I have read today and comments the Senator has heard from his constituents as he has traveled through his great State, a State of great expanse and a State of close to 30 million people? What similarities does the Senator see between these statements and those he has heard around his State?

Mr. CRUZ. I thank my friend from Utah for that very insightful question. Let me note there are many reasons why I love the Senator from Utah. But very near the top of the list is the fact that when he “paraphrases” the Federalist Papers, it is darn near a word-for-word, verbatim quote. MIKE LEE is extraordinary and it is an honor to stand by his side and serve with him.

The stories he has read are entirely consonant with the stories I have heard all across Texas and, frankly, all across the country. This thing is not working. It is not political. It is not partisan. It has nothing to do with what team you are on. The facts are clear. There is a reason why the unions are jumping ship. There is a reason why Teamsters President James Hoffa says ObamaCare is destroying the 40-hour workweek that is the backbone of the American middle class. There is another reason the IRS employees union has asked to be exempted from ObamaCare. These are the guys who are in charge of enforcing it on the rest of us. They have asked to be exempt because it is not working. The facts are clear. It is a train wreck. As the lead author Democratic Senator put it: It is a train wreck.

In fact, let me share some of the tweets that have come in the preceding days. In the preceding days, the American people have been speaking out about ObamaCare and in particular there was a hashtag “DefundObamaCareBecause.” In the last several days, Americans all over this country have tweeted their reason why ObamaCare should be defunded. We will.

I will note to Senator LEE that some months ago, he and I stood on this same Senate floor, side by side with our dear friend Senator RAND PAUL, supporting him in his historic filibuster on drones. At that time, he had the opportunity to read tweets that were supporting RAND’s filibuster. To the best of my knowledge, that was the first time tweets had been read on the Senate floor, which I have joked to my wife makes me happy because 20 years from now if there is some obscure political geek trivial pursuit game, I am pretty confident I am going to be the answer as to the first person to have the chance to read tweets on the Senate floor. I am going to do my best now to be the second person. Now I am reading tweets that concern the hashtag “DefundObamaCareBecause,” but I will note there has been another hashtag tonight: “MakeDCListen.” And that hashtag has been trending higher and higher—“MakeDCListen”—and as the evening goes forward, I fully expect for those of you who have something you want to say, but you are not currently able to be on this Senate floor—maybe in a few years you will be, maybe you will be elected to the Senate and stand at your desk and make your arguments, but right now you are not—let me encourage you to tweet the hashtag “MakeDCListen” and I expect later in the evening to read a sample of those tweets so we can help provide voice to those millions of Americans who are frustrated that DC is not listening.

But then some of the tweets in the past few days with the hashtag “DefundObamaCareBecause.” It is just another way to gain control over people.

Defund ObamaCare because I don’t want the government dictating my health care.

Because I don’t trust the government to run my health care.

Because cancellation notices from my car insurance are gut-wrenching.

Because I don’t want the government deciding my family’s health care.

Because it is a threat to jobs and our economy.

Because it adds layers of government, inefficiency, centralizing control to ivory-tower bureaucrats. Massive drag on the economy.

Because it’s a job-killing machine, up to 20 million jobs. If we listened to the people, if we

Now, that is a pair that gives you Now. That says something.

Because the IRS will be enforcing it.

Because it’s too intrusive on our privacy.

Because it’s a job-killing machine, up to 20 million jobs. If we listened to the people, if we
right now, they just have access to our health care records so it is not like anyone should be concerned about it.

Because it is a job-killing, economy-de-stroying, health care-ruining, debt-explod-ing, out of control government mess.

I like that.

Because it is a job-killing, economy-de-stroying, health care ruining, debt-explod-ing, out of control government mess.

Because ObamaCare is all about socialist control of the people and nothing to do with fixing health care.

Because it was rammed through in the dark of the night that should not have been done.

Because it has already come between me and my doctors and it is not even fully implemented yet.

Next time you see your physician, do you want your friendly neighborhood Federal bureaucrat sitting down and being part of the physician’s meeting? I do not. I know Texans do not either, most Americans do not either.

Because it is a Trojan horse. Inside it will destroy us.

Because even the unions agree it’s not working.

Because we need the IRS to get out of our lives, not make health care decisions for us.

Because it will cost Americans their jobs.

Because recurring being used to move the credit to a single-payer system.

As we noted earlier, that is not—some people dismiss that. Oh, single payer, this is designed to go there. You know that is just crazy, tinfoil hat-wearing stuff. But there is an old saying: Just because you are paranoid doesn’t mean they are not out to get you. Yes, there are people worried about single payer. They have every good reason to be, particularly when the majority leader of the Senate goes on television and says: The purpose of ObamaCare is to send people into a single-payer system, government-provided socialized health care.

That is the express purpose from those who voted for ObamaCare, to de-stroy the private health insurance sys-tem and to move to single-payer gov-ernment socialized medicine.

Because honestly the people do not want it.

Because problems cannot be solved by a larger government than the one that created them.

Because after 3 years, they are still trying to sell it to us.

That is a good point. If it were such a great idea—don’t you remember at the time, they said: Gosh, when people get it, they are going to love it. It is going to save you know what. If it had, we would be having a very dif-ferent discussion. If it had worked, the American people would support it. We would see the results. We would see the benefits, and we would not have this debate.

If it were working well, we would not be having this debate be-cause the American people would sup-port it. The facts are clear. So even those who voted 3 years ago, unless your view of serving in office is: Hey, once I vote, I stick to it no matter what. They say, no matter what, much people are hurting, no matter how big a disaster it is, I ain’t chang-ing no matter what.

I cannot believe there are many Sen-ators in this body who want to ap-proach voting like that. That is not a responsible way to approach a job. The facts are clear. This thing is not work-ing. All 100 of us ought to act to avert this train wreck.

Because if you don’t, your doctor might just retire early.

How many know a doctor who is re-tiring early? I know quite a few who are retiring. Do you think that is good for our health care system, seeing doc-tors retire early? I know older doctors who are advising young students, do not go to med school. Do you think that is good for health care? Do you think that is going to expand our health care if we do not see bright young students going to medical school? That is what ObamaCare is doing.

Because you do not want an IRS agent de-ciding if your mom lives or dies.

Because it makes health insurance less af-fordable. My premiums will be higher to sub-sidize people who cannot afford insurance.

Because even the unions don’t want it.

Because the IRS has shown they are will-ing to abuse power for political gain.

Because it’s not about health care, it is about government control.

Because I shouldn’t have to pay for the murder of innocent, unborn babies through abortion.

Because if it worked, Democratic Senators would not have needed to be bribed to vote for it.

Because the death panel is an unchecked bureaucracy accountable to no one.

Because I love my current health care and doctors.

Do you like your current health care? Do you like your doctor? Do you want to keep seeing your doctor? I tell you, Americans all over this country are losing their health care because of ObamaCare. They are losing their ability to see their doctors. That is what happens if the Senate does not act to defund ObamaCare.

Because the majority of the country is against it.

Because premiums up 100 percent after dropped off spouse’s plan. Elimination of meds coverage, reduction of choices and treatments.

These are real people tweeting. They are sharing their stories of why they do not like ObamaCare. Do you notice these stories are not: Because I am a Republican. Because I am a Democrat. Because I believe in this ideology. It is because: This thing is hurting me and my family. If this body were listening to the people, we would have 100 Sen-ators concerned about all of the Amer-i-cans being hurt by ObamaCare and here at any hour of the night ready to act to stop it.

Because no one wants to live in their par-ent’s basement forever.

Because Reagan once said, you can’t be for big government, big bureaucracy and still be for the little guy.

Boy, ain’t that the truth.

Because I don’t want to pay more taxes to fund it.

Because it does nothing to reduce costs while hurting many full-time employees who are dropped to part time.

Because it makes health insurance less af-fordable, my premiums will be higher to sub-sidize people who cannot afford insurance.

Because it actually does add a dime to the deficit, and a lot of them.

Because—

Three words in all caps.

—INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE.

Because it is killing full-time jobs and stunting the growth of businesses that want to hire.

Because government should not be in charge of something as important as health care.

Because the devil himself wouldn’t put the IRS between you and your doctor.

I like that one too.

Because the more exemptions that are given out, the more ObamaCare won’t work.

Because I cannot afford to get two jobs, pay outrageous prices for crappy insurance. I will lose my full time.

Because that time Congress passed the law and then excluded themselves.

#healthcarehypocrisy.

Because doctors and hospitals are already becoming limited.

Because it is designed to collapse private insurance and force us all to single payer. Sorry.

Again, I would note that is not hypo-thetical. That is what majority leader HARRY REID has publicly said on tele-vision.

Because insurance isn’t very helpful when you can’t find a doctor.

Because I don’t need to spend a decade of my life filling out government forms.

Because baby-boomer doctors will retire in droves, plus more who won’t practice in this environment.

Because if it is not good enough for Con-gress, it sure as shooting is not good enough for the people.

Those are sentiments we are hearing from all across the country. Those are sentiments that reflect the views of the American people, not just in Texas, in all 50 States, and not just Republicans but Democrats, Independents, Liber-tarians, and Americans. They understand that when you have a law that is kill-ing jobs, when you have a law that is hammering small businesses, when you have a law that is forcing people into part-time work and to work 25 hours a week, when you have a law that is causing skyrocketing insurance pre-miums, when you have a law that is causing more and more people to lose their health insurance, you have a law that is not working.

Those were a train wreck, as the Demo-cratic Senator who is the lead author of this bill described it. Yet right now the Senate is not listening to the American people. The Democrats in the Senate understandably have circled the wagons. They passed this bill, and even if it is a sinking ship, we have yet to see Democrats come out and say: We tried it. It didn’t work. Let’s listen to the American people. I hope the time comes this week where we see some courageous Democrats stand—and let me say congressional Democrats—and say: We do not want to lose the people. We want to do the right thing, and the right thing is to get rid of this bill. As we noted earlier, that is not—some people dismiss that. Oh, single payer, this is designed to go there. You know that is just crazy, tinfoil hat-wearing stuff. But there is an old saying: Just because you are paranoid doesn’t mean they are not out to get you. Yes, there are people worried about single payer. They have every good reason to be, particularly when the majority leader of the Senate goes on television and says: The purpose of ObamaCare is to send people into a single-payer system, government-provided socialized health care.

That is the express purpose from those who voted for ObamaCare, to de-stroy the private health insurance sys-tem and to move to single-payer gov-ernment socialized medicine.

Because honestly the people do not want it.

Because problems cannot be solved by a larger government than the one that created them.

Because after 3 years, they are still trying to sell it to us.

That is a good point. If it were such a great idea—don’t you remember at the time, they said: Gosh, when people get it, they are going to love it. It is going to save you know what. If it had, we would be having a very dif-ferent discussion. If it had worked, the American people would support it. We would see the results. We would see the benefits, and we would not have this debate.

If it were working well, we would not be having this debate be-cause the American people would sup-port it. The facts are clear. So even those who voted 3 years ago, unless your view of serving in office is: Hey, once I vote, I stick to it no matter what. They say, no matter what, much people are hurting, no matter how big a disaster it is, I ain’t chang-ing no matter what.
Now I will know, as someone not entirely unfamiliar with receiving withering criticisms from one's own party. There are worse things in life. I promise you that it is, in the order of things, to be worried about, quite low. You know, there’s a lot more concerned about a single mom working in a diner trying to feed her kids than I am about whether some Senator or some congressional staffer wants to run to a newspaper and say something mean about me.

So to the Democratic Senator who is thinking about responding to the concerns that I know you are hearing from your citizens, because we are hearing it all over the country, let me suggest a little bit of grief for breaking party discipline is a small price to pay for doing your job, for listening to the American people.

Let me say to the Republicans: There is a lot of concern about political blame. There is a lot of concern about: If we would just get a symbolic vote so we can all say we are opposed to it, but let’s not actually do anything to change ObamaCare. Let me suggest to my Republican friends that we should worry a lot less about blame and credit and politics and just worry about fixing the darn thing for the American people.

If we get back to an economy where jobs are booming, where small businesses are thriving, where people who are struggling want the American dream can get that first job and get that second job and climb that economic ladder and advance, provide for their families, that answers a whole lot of problems.

I have heard some partisan observers say: ObamaCare is not the biggest job killer in the country. No. 1, it is ironic that is the particular debate, about whether it is the biggest job killer or the second biggest job killer. But let me tell you, I do not think there is any debate on that question. So let me point to a list by Investors Business Daily of 300 cuts to work hours or jobs.

Well, if you don’t believe ObamaCare is the biggest job killer in the country, look to the facts. This year report after report has rolled in about employers restricting work hours to less than 30 hours per week—the point where the mandate kicks in. The data also points to reductions in low-wage industries. It is low-wage industries in particular because the people who get hammered by this are not the CEOs. It is not the rich. The rich have done just fine under President Obama. It is hard-working American families, the people who are struggling. It is the young people, Hispanics, African Americans, and single moms. They are the ones who are losing their jobs and being forced to work 29 hours a week.

Investor’s Business Daily compiled a list of job additions that provide strong proof that ObamaCare’s employer mandate is behind cuts to work or staffing cuts. As of September 18, 2013, their ObamaCare scorecard included 301 employers.

In the State of Alabama, Houston County cut the hours of part-time employees to less than 30 hours per week. In California, Biola University cut student associate faculty members.

In Illinois, Vincennes cut the hours of part-time employees to less than 30 hours per week. In Indiana, Ball State University limited work hours for graduate assistants.

In New Jersey, Toms River will cut part-time hours to 25 hours per week, effective July 2014. In North Carolina, Forsyth Community Technical College reduced hours for adjunct faculty to below 30 hours per week. Also in North Carolina, Wilkes Community College reduced teaching loads for adjunct faculty to below 30 hours a week. Let me go through a few of these that are much the same.

In Texas, Consolidated Restaurant Operations and Dave & Buster’s; Pennsylvania, Philadelphia University; Virginia, K-VA-T Food Stores; Missouri, Three Rivers College. In Alabama, the University of Alabama capped student work hours at 20 hours per week; in fact, be justifiable punishment for their having beaten Texas A&M, but it is still not good for the students who would like to work more than 20 hours per week. Florida, Brevard County; Florida, Buca di Beppo restaurant chain; Florida, Hillsborough Community College; Florida, St. Petersburg College; Georgia, Cherokee County School Board; Indiana, Hancock County; Indiana, Morgan County; Michigan, Central Michigan University; New Jersey, NEMP trucking company; North Carolina, Henderson; Ohio, White Castle. We read a letter from White Castle earlier today. They used to open eight new restaurants a year. They have reduced it to two. The truth of all of these people who won’t get jobs because there is no White Castle over there, not to mention all of the hungry college kids who at 3 in the morning are just craving a White Castle and they can’t find one. Oregon, Shari’s restaurants; Pennsylvania, Carnegie Museum; Tennessee, Oneida Special School District; Tennessee, Scott County School System; Tennessee, Stewart County School System; Texas, Jim’s Restaurant; Virginia, Christopher Savvides Restaurant; Wisconsin, Wisconsin-Hazelhurst-Lake Tomahawk School District; Wisconsin, Trig’s Supermarkets; Alabama, University of North Alabama; California, Fatburger. Now there is truth in advertising. Iowa, Lee County; Michigan, Delta County; Texas, Bee County; Idaho, Boundary County; North Carolina, Rutherford County; Pennsylvania, Lawrence County; Michigan, Kenowa Hills Public Schools; New Jersey, City of Burlington Public Schools; Texas, the Lion & Rose British Restaurant & Pub; Texas, MTC Inc. Restaurant Management; Utah, Millard School District; Arkansas, Area Agency on Aging of

In Arizona, Arizona State University limited course loads for nontenured associate faculty members. In Maine, Marine subgroup, the Subway franchise reduced worker hours to no more than 29 per week. In New York, Finger Lakes Community College capped course loads for adjunct faculty. In South Carolina, Tsunami Surf Shops—I like that name; that is a surf shop with an attitude—will limit workers to less than 30 hours per week.

In Illinois, Southern Illinois University limited graduate teaching assistants to 20 hours per week. In Indiana, Vincennes cut the hours of part-timers to 29 per week. In California, the Mexican American Opportunity Foundation cut the hours of employees working up to 39 hours a week to less than 30. I am talking about a real impact from this law. In Georgia, Georgia Military College cut the hours of adjunct faculty to below 30 hours per week. In Virginia, the Subway franchisee, reduced hours for hourly wage earners to below 30 per week.

In Indiana, Ball State University limited work hours for graduate assistants.

In New Jersey, Toms River will cut part-time hours to 25 hours per week, effective July 2014. In North Carolina, Forsyth Community Technical College reduced hours for adjunct faculty to below 30 hours per week. Also in North Carolina, Wilkes Community College reduced teaching loads for adjunct faculty to below 30 hours a week.

Let me go through a few of these that are much the same:

In Texas, Consolidated Restaurant Operations and Dave & Buster’s; Pennsylvania, Philadelphia University; Virginia, K-VA-T Food Stores; Missouri, Three Rivers College. In Alabama, the University of Alabama capped student work hours at 20 hours per week; in fact, be justifiable punishment for their having beaten Texas A&M, but it is still not good for the students who would like to work more than 20 hours per week. Florida, Brevard County; Florida, Buca di Beppo restaurant chain; Florida, Hillsborough Community College; Florida, St. Petersburg College; Georgia, Cherokee County School Board; Indiana, Hancock County; Indiana, Morgan County; Michigan, Central Michigan University; New Jersey, NEMP trucking company; North Carolina, Henderson; Ohio, White Castle. We read a letter from White Castle earlier today. They used to open eight new restaurants a year. They have reduced it to two. The truth of all of these people who won’t get jobs because there is no White Castle over there, not to mention all of the hungry college kids who at 3 in the morning are just craving a White Castle and they can’t find one. Oregon, Shari’s restaurants; Pennsylvania, Carnegie Museum; Tennessee, Oneida Special School District; Tennessee, Scott County School System; Tennessee, Stewart County School System; Texas, Jim’s Restaurant; Virginia, Christopher Savvides Restaurant; Wisconsin, Wisconsin-Hazelhurst-Lake Tomahawk School District; Wisconsin, Trig’s Supermarkets; Alabama, University of North Alabama; California, Fatburger. Now there is truth in advertising. Iowa, Lee County; Michigan, Delta County; Texas, Bee County; Idaho, Boundary County; North Carolina, Rutherford County; Pennsylvania, Lawrence County; Michigan, Kenowa Hills Public Schools; New Jersey, City of Burlington Public Schools; Texas, the Lion & Rose British Restaurant & Pub; Texas, MTC Inc. Restaurant Management; Utah, Millard School District; Arkansas, Area Agency on Aging of
Western Arkansas: Arkansas, Walmart Stores, Inc. Has anyone heard of them? They increased temp share of workforce to “fewer than 10 percent” from 1 to 2 percent before this year. California, CKE Restaurants, Inc.

They lost good and gone.

Every one of those—and I read the first 50 or 75 out of 301—it is all over the country. It is every State. A lot of folks in this body may say: Well, that doesn’t impact us. What is the problem? If you serve in the Senate, your salary is guaranteed no matter what. Besides, we are exempted from ObamaCare. So what is the concern?

That is official Washington for you. What is the problem? Government is a boom business. If you look at the counties surrounding Washington, DC, they are booming. Why? Because government is growing, growing, growing, and growing.

At every place I just read, there are men and women working, working, working. But almost none of them are wealthy. Almost none of them are fat cats. Almost none of them are, as the President likes to invoke so often, millionaires and billionaires. They are 22-year-old kids, some who are recent college graduates and some who are out of high school. But they are trying to work. They would like to make a better life. They are not able to do so. They are not able to do so because of ObamaCare.

Every one of those names—and listening to those names, it would be easy to zone out: Oh, another name, another name; those are just empty names. Every one of those names—are they men, women, and their kids who are suffering because of that? If you have a job, working hard, trying to provide for your family, and you are told: Congratulations; you will be working 29 hours a week courtesy of the Senate and ObamaCare—talk about a failed law.

In the last election, young people voted overwhelmingly for the reelection of the President. Indeed, some of my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle believe that a new dawn has arrived, that young people will remain permanently Democrats and thus keep a Democratic majority in the Senate for time immemorial. I am not convinced of that.

I will say it is interesting—you could not design a law to do more damage to young people and ObamaCare. The way you sat down and tried. If you sat down and said: Let’s really pound the living daylights out of young people, you couldn’t do it.

We will talk later tonight about premiums that are going up, especially for young people, because one way to understand ObamaCare is it is a massive wealth transfer from young healthy people to everyone else. If you are young and healthy, Congress looked at you, licked your chops, and said: You are free. Only the people who are getting their hours forcibly reduced are overwhelmingly young people. They are people who are starting their climb on the economic ladder. If you don’t get that first job, you don’t get the second, and you don’t get the third. It impacts you for a long time.

Just recently, I read an article in the Wall Street Journal that is relevant for every young person to read because it explains how ObamaCare is impacting you not just today but for decades to come. I think young people have a particularly acute desire to see this Senate act this week to defund ObamaCare because it is young people paying the price. Don’t take my word for it, take the Wall Street Journal. On September 1, 2013, the Wall Street had a major article that was entitled “Wanted: Jobs for the New ‘Lost’ Generation.” If you are a young person, you should feel excited: there is now a title for your generation—the “lost generation.” I mentioned that if you were trying to design a law to hurt young people, ObamaCare—you couldn’t do better than that. Well, it has produced a lost generation.

Here is what the Wall Street Journal said:

Like so many young Americans, Derek Wetherell is stuck. At 23 years old, he has a job, but not a career, and little prospect for advancement. He has tens of thousands of dollars in student debt.

I know what student debt is like. It was only 2 years ago that I paid off my student debt to pay my way through college and law school. There are a lot of young people right now struggling to pay off student debt. I will tell you, if you combine student debt with a dead-end job or not being able to find a job at all, that is a recipe for a lost generation.

Continuing with Derek Wetherell:

He has tens of thousands of dollars in student debt, but no college degree.

That is becoming more and more common. People take out loans to get a college degree, but they are not finishing. They are not able to finish.

He says he is more likely to move back in with his parents than to buy a home—

The American dream used to be that everyone wanted to buy their own home, have a white picket fence, have a swing out front on which your kids could play. That was our parents’ dreams. That was their parents’ dreams. That has been the American dream for generations. I ask young people, how many of you feel that dream is a realistic prospect for you? It was for your parents when they were your age. Let me tell you, the policies this Congress has put in place because we are not listening to the American people are a direct cause of that. ObamaCare is a direct cause of that.

Mr. Wetherell continues:

He says he is more likely to move back in with his parents than to buy a home, and he doesn’t know what he will do if his car—a 2001 Chrysler Sebring with well over 100,000 miles—breaks down.

Is there anyone else in America who has a car that is 12 years old with 100,000 miles and is wondering what happens if they wake up one morning and turn the key and nothing happens? If you have a good job, if you are climbing the economic ladder, if you have career prospects, you can deal with that. If you are stuck in a dead-end job and living paycheck to paycheck, that is a huge problem.

“I’m kind of spinning my wheels,” Mr. Wetherell says. “We can wishfully think that eventually it’s going to get better, but we really don’t know, and that doesn’t really help us now.”

There are millions of Americans who feel exactly like that.

Mr. Wetherell is a member of the lost generation, a group that is now only beginning to gain attention from many economists and employment experts.

Young people should feel particularly privileged that they have coined a new term for their generation—the lost generation—because of ObamaCare and the policies of this Senate.

From Oakland to Orlando—and across the ocean in Birmingham and Barcelona—young people have come of age amid the most prolonged period of economic distress since the Great Depression.

Most, like Mr. Wetherell, have little memory of the financial crisis itself, which struck while they were still in high school. But they are all too familiar with its aftermath: the crippling recession, which made it all but impossible for many young people to get a first foothold in the job market, and the painfully slow recovery that has left the prosperity of their parents’ generation out of reach—perhaps permanently.

“This has been for quite a while now a hostile environment for young people.” said Paul Taylor, executive vice president of the Pew Research Center, which has studied the impact of the recession on young people.

“This is all they’ve really known.”

The financial crisis that struck five years ago this month opened up a sinkhole in the U.S. economy that swallowed Americans of all ages and backgrounds. Retirees lost life savings. Families lost homes. Millions of Americans lost their jobs. Five years later, their recovery is being filled in slowly. The unemployment rate is down to 7.3 percent amid slow, steady job growth.

Although, as we noted earlier, that 7.3 percent vastly understates it, because so many have given up looking for work altogether.

The stock market has rallied to new highs. Home prices are rebounding. Total output has surpassed its prerecession peak.

But the recovery has left many young people behind. The official unemployment rate for Americans under age 25 was 15.6 percent in August, down from a peak of nearly 20 percent in 2010 but still more than 2½ times the rate of those 25 and older—a gap that has widened during the recovery.

In other words, it has gotten worse for young people during the past few years.

Moreover, the unemployment rate ignores the hundreds of thousands of young people who have taken shelter from the weak job market by going to college, enrolling in training programs or otherwise sitting on the sidelines.

Do any of you know anyone—do any of you right now, know anyone doing that—going to school because, gosh, jobs are so lousy, maybe, you think,
you will try to do something at school and maybe things will get better? If ObamaCare keeps hammering small businesses so they do not hire new workers and they keep reducing hours, the prospects for things getting better are not very bright. Even those lucky enough to be employed are often struggling. Little more than half are working full-time—compared with about 80 percent of the population at large—and 12 percent earn minimum wage or less.

Let me repeat that. For young people who are working, little more than half are working full time. If you are a young person, if you are hoping to start a career, being forced into a part-time job because of ObamaCare is a big problem.

The median weekly wage for young workers has fallen more than 5 percent since 2007, after adjusting for inflation; for those 25 and older, wages have stayed roughly flat.

It is getting worse for young people. It is young people who are really getting hit by this. Let me ask young people: What urgency do you see in the Senate? Is the floor of the Senate filled with Senators saying there is a crisis with young people, let’s step forward and fix the job problem? No, because Senators have very busy calendars. There are cocktail parties to go to. Responding to the crisis that young people are facing is not high on the priority of enough Members of this Senate because government has put policies in place that have so hampered small businesses that they have created a job market that is simply incredibly difficult for young people.

The recession of the early 1980s was comparable but was followed by a rapid recovery.

Well, gosh, what happened in the early 1980s? President Ronald Reagan was elected. He implemented policies that exact opposite of this administration’s policies. Instead of jacking up taxes by $1.7 trillion, as this Congress and this President has done, President Reagan slashed taxes and simplified the Tax Code. Instead of exploding government and the debt, President Reagan restrained the growth of government spending. And instead of unleashing regulators like locusts that destroy small businesses, President Reagan restrained regulation and the result was incredible growth that small businesses have prospered and thrived. They have created jobs, and the result has been young people could get jobs, full-time jobs that advance towards a career and towards the American Dream.

The economic legacy of the Great Depression was erased to a large degree by World War II and the boom that followed. No comparable but was followed by a rapid recovery.

Mr. Wetherell, the son of an electrician, grew up in Imperial, MO, a very small town south of St. Louis, where job opportunities were limited even when the economy was strong, and it wasn’t when he graduated from high school in 2008. He enrolled at the University of Missouri, where he completed a full course load, had a full-time job at a local grocery store, and tracked his near-constant commitments on a dry-erase board in his room.

Eventually, the schedule wore him down. He withdrew from school in 2011, though he still plans to complete his degree. He owes $27,000 in student debt—roughly his annual pretax earnings—with three semesters still to go. Mr. Wetherell is better off than many of his peers. He works at Schnucks, a locally owned supermarket chain where he is a union member.

And, by the way, that is one of the reasons why so many unions that have supported ObamaCare are turning on it now. The recession of the early 1980s was comparable but was followed by a rapid recovery.

Well, gosh, what happened in the early 1980s? President Ronald Reagan was elected. He implemented policies that exact opposite of this administration’s policies. Instead of jacking up taxes by $1.7 trillion, as this Congress and this President has done, President Reagan slashed taxes and simplified the Tax Code. Instead of exploding government and the debt, President Reagan restrained the growth of government spending. And instead of unleashing regulators like locusts that destroy small businesses, President Reagan restrained regulation and the result was incredible growth that small businesses have prospered and thrived. They have created jobs, and the result has been young people could get jobs, full-time jobs that advance towards a career and towards the American Dream.

The economic legacy of the Great Depression was erased to a large degree by World War II and the boom that followed.

One recent study by Yale University economist Lisa Kahn found that after the 1980s recession, new college graduates lost 6 to 7 percent in initial wages for every one percentage point increase in unemployment rate. The effects shrank over time, but even 15 years after graduation, those who finished college in bad economic times earned less than similar people who graduated in better times. Some never caught up at all.

So this stagnant economic growth, if you are a young person, I am sorry to tell you, it is not just a problem now. If you don’t see the Senate finally listening to the American people, finally getting control of the economic growth, the stagnant economic opportunities we have right now are likely to haunt the generation of young people for decades to come. This is an urgency that should have this Senate floor packed.

You know what. A lot of men and women in this body have kids who are in that generation. And we should be heartened, we should be outraged that the future of our young people is jeopardized.

Mr. Wetherell, is the son of an electrician. He grew up in Imperial, MO, a very small town south of St. Louis, where job opportunities were limited even when the economy was strong, and it wasn’t when he graduated from high school in 2008. He enrolled at the University of Missouri, where he completed a full course load, had a full-time job at a local grocery store, and tracked his near-constant commitments on a dry erase board in his room.

Eventually, the schedule wore him down. He withdrew from school in 2011, though he still plans to complete his degree. He owes $27,000 in student debt—roughly his annual pretax earnings—with three semesters still to go. Mr. Wetherell is better off than many of his peers. He works at Schnucks, a locally owned supermarket chain where he is a union member.

And, by the way, that is one of the reasons why so many unions that have supported ObamaCare are turning on it now. The recession of the early 1980s was comparable but was followed by a rapid recovery.

Well, gosh, what happened in the early 1980s? President Ronald Reagan was elected. He implemented policies that exact opposite of this administration’s policies. Instead of jacking up taxes by $1.7 trillion, as this Congress and this President has done, President Reagan slashed taxes and simplified the Tax Code. Instead of exploding government and the debt, President Reagan restrained the growth of government spending. And instead of unleashing regulators like locusts that destroy small businesses, President Reagan restrained regulation and the result was incredible growth that small businesses have prospered and thrived. They have created jobs, and the result has been young people could get jobs, full-time jobs that advance towards a career and towards the American Dream.

The economic legacy of the Great Depression was erased to a large degree by World War II and the boom that followed. No comparable but was followed by a rapid recovery.
If you try to be kind and good, you will be blessed with life and goodness and honor. So that is the first story for Caroline and Catherine. The second one is what they know is my favorite story. It was my favorite story when I was a kid and it is a story I love reading to them. I actually don’t get to read it to them often because we have a rule at home that they get to pick the books. For whatever reason, they don’t want to read Dr. Seuss’s “Green Eggs and Ham” all that often. I don’t get to read it that often because I tell them, Go pick the books you want to read, and I read to them. But since tonight, girls, you aren’t here, you don’t get to pick the book, so I got to pick “Green Eggs and Ham.” I love this story, so I am going to read it to you, Sam-I-am. That Sam-I-am! I do not like that Sam-I-am! Do you like green eggs and ham? I do not like them, Sam-I-am. I do not like green eggs and ham. Would you like them here or there? I would not like them here or there. I would not like them anywhere. I do not like green eggs and ham. I do not like them, Sam-I-am. Would you like them in a house? Would you like them with a mouse? I do not like them in a house. I do not like them with a mouse. I do not like them here or there. I do not like them anywhere. I do not like green eggs and ham. I do not like them, Sam-I-am. Would you like them in a box? Would you eat them with a fox? Not in a box. Not with a fox. Not in a house. Not with a mouse. I would not eat them here or there. I would not eat them anywhere. I would not eat green eggs and ham. I do not like them, Sam-I-am. Would you? Could you? In a car? Eat them! Eat them! Here they are. I would not, could not, in a car. You may like them. You will see. You may like them in a tree! I would not, could not, in a tree. Not in a car! You let me be. I do not like them in a box. I do not like them with a fox. I do not like them here or there. I do not like them anywhere. I do not like green eggs and ham. I do not like them, Sam-I-am. Would you? Could you? On a train! A train! A train! A train! A train! I would not, could you, on a train? Not on a train! Not in a tree! Not in a car! Sam, let me be! I would not, could not, in a box. I would not, could not, with a fox. I will not eat them with a mouse. I will not eat them in a house. I will not eat them here or there. I do not like green eggs and ham. I do not like them, Sam-I-am. Say! In the dark? Here in the dark! Would you, could you, in the dark? I would not, could not, in the dark. Would you, could you, in the rain? I would not, could not, in the rain. Not in the dark. Not on a train. Not in a car. Not in a tree! I do not like them, Sam, you see. Not in a house. Not in a box. Not with a mouse. Not with a fox. I will not eat them here or there. I do not like them anywhere! You do not like green eggs and ham? I do not like them, Sam-I-am. Could you, would you, with a goat? I would not, could not, with a goat! Would you, could you, on a boat? I could not, would not, on a boat. I will not, will not, with a goat. I will not eat them in the rain. I will not eat them on a train. Not in the dark! Not in a tree! Not in a car! You let them be! I do not like them in a box. I do not like them with a fox. I will not eat them in a house. I do not like them here or there. I do not like them ANYWHERE! I do not like green eggs and ham! I do not like them, Sam-I-am. You do not like them.

So you say. Try them! Try them! And you may. Try them and you may, I say. Sam-I-am! If you will let me be, I will try them. You will see.

And on this page he is simply holding green eggs and ham on a fork preparing to bite them.

Say! I like green eggs and ham! I do! I like them, Sam-I-am! And I would eat them in a boat. And I would eat them with a goat . . . And I will eat them in the rain. And in the dark. And on a train. And in a car. And in a tree. They are so good, so good, you see! So I will eat them in a box. And I will eat them with a fox. And I will eat them in a house. And I will eat them with a mouse. And I will eat them here and there. Say! I will eat them ANYWHERE! I do so like green eggs and ham! Thank you! Thank you, Sam-I-am!

I want to say to Caroline and Catherine, my angels, I love you with all my heart. It is bedtime. Give Mommy a hug and a kiss, brush your teeth, say your prayers, and Daddy is going to be home soon to read to you in person.

Let me say more broadly to everyone, “Green Eggs and Ham” has some applicability, as curious as it might sound, to ObamaCare, because 3½ years ago President Obama and Senate Democrats told the American people, Just try ObamaCare. Just try it. There were an awful lot of Republicans who were very skeptical of it. I think for good reasons, but very skeptical. And we were told try it, try it, try it, try it. Unfortunately, through an exercise of brute political force, ObamaCare became the law of the land.

But the difference with “Green Eggs and Ham” is when Americans tried it, they discovered they did not like green...
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eggs and ham and they did not like ObamaCare either. They did not like ObamaCare in a box, with a fox, in a house, or with a mouse. It is not working.

One of the oldest definitions of insanity is not to do the same thing over and over expecting different results. I understand why many supported ObamaCare in the beginning. But if you look at the facts, if you look at the evidence, if you look at what is happening when the American people have not been working as promised, and when we listen to the people—if we listen to the American people, every one of us will stand together and say, We are going to stop this train wreck. Together, we need to make DC listen.

Mr. ENZI. Through the Chair, would the Senator yield for a question, retaining the floor?

Mr. CRUZ. I am happy to yield for a question without yielding the floor.

Mr. ENZI. I want to thank the Senator for the recitation of “Green Eggs and Ham.” That is as good as I have heard. I loved the different voices in it. One of my favorites was “Hand, Hand, Finger, Thumb” by Dr. Seuss. And another one was “Hop on Pop.” I think all of those would have related to the messages here. They might even be simple enough that we could get the message across.

I appreciate all the passion and preparation the Senator has put into explaining this and his careful way with words.

We are on a continuing resolution, and I don’t know that people out there understand what continuing resolution is. It means that we failed to do our job on time—that we should have had 12 appropriations bills, one at a time, and been able to go through them with some care.

I think maybe the Senator would agree that perhaps if we had done that, when we got to Health and Human Services we might have had the issue on the individual items of defunding ObamaCare. Had we had those individual ones, I think some of those would have passed and it wouldn’t have had to be an all-or-nothing as we have now.

Would the Senator agree that doing it this way, particularly if we have no debate and no amendments, would be the wrong way, and that all we are doing is pushing more money further down the road that again should have been covered by appropriations in a very timely manner? Isn’t that the same problem we had with sequester, where we went through two-thirds of the year when there was supposed to be a 2.5 percent sequester, so we only had 4 months left and those agencies had to pack it into the 4 months, and that made it 5.3 percent and that hurt worse? Of course, the President’s note to everybody to “make it hurt” was not particularly helpful either.

But aren’t we faced again with that when we are doing a 2-month delay on a CR, so that we have to go through this exercise again probably when we would like to be home at Christmas personally reading those stories to kids? I would like to be reading to my grandkids.

One other thing that he said in a box here that the American public doesn’t like, I don’t like, but it wasn’t our doing.

If those bills would have been brought up one at a time, we could have debated and gotten into some details on them. It has been a long time since we got into details on trillions of dollars of spending. Health care is a part of that, and health care deserves some individual attention. That is what the Senator and I and a number of people are trying to give it, some individual attention. But we are being denied that right. We are not being allowed to go into it in detail so we can show exactly which parts we would defund, which parts we would dismantle and replace with something better.

I spent a lot of time on this bill because I was here when it was going through the committee process. In fact, I had a 10-step plan on my Web site that would have amended this bill and it would have been paid for. But that isn’t a part of the bill. When they say the Republicans don’t have solutions, they are not willing to look at any of the solutions even if they would wind up in a better situation.

This was passed with a partisan government. It is a health care that is failing and we are not getting a chance to change it. Of course, I am one of those who would have liked to have repealed it and started over again and gotten it right.

I know of another substitute bill that Senator Coburn and Senator Burr did, and that would have been a better replacement because they covered more of the things the President, in a joint session of Congress when he covered it—I was on a committee that was working on it particularly, and I sat there and took extensive notes. The next day in our meeting I said, There are 14 things that he said in that speech we did not cover and I think we should have covered them.

Instead, we wound up with the bill we have because there were 60 Democrats and 40 Republicans. They had to come to a deal in order to get the 60 to stick together, and it is surprising they did stick together.

I will end on that question. I have one other I would like to ask too. But I think our failure to do appropriations leads us to this point, and also gets us to a point where we can’t go into the details of the bill. We have to take an all-or-nothing approach. That is not legislating. That is deal-making. I think we have an alternate approach and I would like the Senator to comment on it.

Mr. CRUZ. I thank my friend from Wyoming for that very good question. I thank him also for his early support of this fight to defund ObamaCare. When Senator Mike Lee and I began this endeavor, Senator Enzi was with us from the start. I am grateful for his support and for his leadership.

This exercise is exactly right. We would not be in this mess were it not for the failure of the Senate, the failure of the Senate to do its job, the failure of the Senate to have open debate, to have open amendments, the failure of the Senate to actually pass appropriations bills.

Continuing resolutions exist because Congress has fallen down on the job. Congress has not actually passed appropriations bills into law. One of the things the continuing resolution does—a continuing resolution basically says let’s keep everything going because we have not actually passed the appropriations bills that would properly make the funding decisions on the various agencies of government. But a continuing resolution cannot do those things who want to keep funding ObamaCare to try to hold everything hostage to it.

For example, you hear some in the Democratic majority suggesting—they often run through a parade of horribles. If this thing is a government shutdown, if the continuing resolution doesn’t pass, here are all of the horribles that will happen.

Some of the parade of horribles that are suggested are contrary to law. For example, they say the American people will not get their Social Security payment or they will not get their Medicare or they won’t get their Medicaid or we won’t pay interest on the debt. That is not the way the Government works. All of those are paid through mandatory spending. The continuing resolution does not impact those continuing to happen. I note in 1995 when there were two partial temporary shutdowns, Social Security payment was not interrupted, Medicare payment or they wouldn’t get their Social Security or they won’t get their payments. If those bills would have been passed, the temporary shutdowns, Social Security payment or Medicare payment, the interest on the debt continued to be paid. All that continued.

Another thing those who are trying to force ObamaCare on the American people frequently want to hold hostage is the men and women in the military. My friend from Wyoming noted if we passed appropriations bills that would not be a problem. The House has passed an appropriations bill for the military. Yet the majority leader, Harry Reid, has continued to go out, the interest on the debt continued to be paid. The Senate has not actually passed appropriations bills.

But the Senate did not do its job; we did not pass the appropriations bill for the military.

That leaves a tinny window for the President to threaten. If Congress listens to the American people and defunds ObamaCare, we may just stop paying the men and women of the military. Let me be absolutely clear. Under
Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask permission to ask another question through the Chair, with the Senator being allowed to keep the floor.

Mr. CRUZ. I am happy to yield for a question without yielding the floor. I have asked the Senator agree that there are a number of things in this bill that have been changed because we have recognized that those things would not work? We have changed—not we, the President has changed these things. I am having trouble finding in the law where those changes come from. There is not a lot of waiver authority in the bill, but every time a difficulty is found with the bill, then there appears to be a waiver so that particular part of the bill no longer exists.

I have never seen that done before on legislation. How do they take a piece of the law that is in the bill, that does not have a waiver right, and go ahead and exempt us under that particular part of the law? I am particularly sensitive on because I worked on it very diligently. As the bill came through committee, that piece was the one where Congress should be under the law that we passed.

That got remodeled, as you will recall, a little bit so that the committee staffs did not have to come under it because the committee staffs were actually going to finish up the bill. But we have had changes for all of our staffs to be under that bill.

Would the Senator agree that one of the amendments that we have not been able to vote on—it would have only taken 30 minutes to do a 15-minute vote. That is kind of standard around here; it takes us a little longer to do a 15-minute vote. Heck, it takes us 20 minutes to do a 10-minute vote and that has to follow on the heels of a 30-minute 15-minute vote.

We could have had a vote from our Senator, going on television and saying: Well, if they stick to their guns on this, it is going to shut down the government.

The Senator from Wyoming points out there is no reason for that. We could have passed the appropriations bill or we could do what the House of Representatives did. The House of Representatives, in an overwhelming vote, 232 Members, including 2 Democrats, in an overwhelming vote, passed appropriations bills, we would have taken off the table one after the other after the other of these hostages that are being held as the price to force ObamaCare on the American people.

Part of the reason why the Democratic majority of the Senate does that is because the debate on the merits of ObamaCare is hard to win. You notice we are, by and large, not engaging in a debate on the merits of ObamaCare, in terms of defining ObamaCare. You don’t see Democratic Senators talking about all the people who lost their jobs, you don’t see Senator from Wyoming points out so correctly.

Senator from Wyoming and the political appointees of the Government—Including, I note, some parts of the Federal Government that I am certain House Republicans are not fans of—yet they voted to fund all of it except for ObamaCare.

I know my friend Congressman LOUIE GOHMERT has come over to the Senate floor in a show of solidarity. I appreciate Congressman GOHMERT joining us.

I note if the Senate wants to avoid a shutdown, it can do so. Indeed, last night I took the opportunity to ask the majority leader, Why don’t we avert this whole train wreck right now? Why don’t we agree by unanimous consent to pass the continuing resolution the House has passed, take the prospect of a shutdown off the table entirely, and defund ObamaCare because it is hurting the American people? Majority Leader REID objected and said no. No, he wants to keep ObamaCare, he wants to focus on the American people. Critically, he is using the threat of a government shutdown to try to do so. That, I suggest, is inconsistent with the obligation that every Senator has.

Mr. CRUZ. I thank my colleague for that very good question. The simple answer is no, the President does not have the authority to rewrite the law or alter the law. We operate under a principle that no one is above the law. We are a nation of laws and not of men. There are many disturbing aspects of ObamaCare, but one of the persistent ones is this law has been such a train wreck that the approach of the President has been, over and over, simply to disregard the language of the law, to pretend as if the law of the United States does not exist because as passed it was such a bad law that is manifested, as my friend from Wyoming pointed out so accurately, is to grant exemptions to politically favored classes.

It started out with big business. Giant corporations were all, with the wave of a pen, told don’t worry about ObamaCare. It is supposed to kick in for you January 1 of next year, but the President has decided he is going to do a favor for big businesses that he will not do for small businesses. That he will not do for hard-working American families.

The next significant waiver we saw was for Members of Congress. It occurred after a closed-door meeting here in the Capitol where majority leader HARRY REID and all the Senate Democrats, according to the public reports, came to the President and said: We want out of the ObamaCare exchanges. As my friend from Wyoming pointed out, if the ObamaCare exchanges were a good thing, if ObamaCare was working, why would there be panic among Senate Democrats saying please exempt Members of Congress? Why would there be panic among congressional staffers, as I can assure you there is, in a bipartisan way, about being subjected to these ObamaCare exchanges? Why would there be such opposition to subjecting the political appointees of the Obama administration to the ObamaCare exchanges or, as my friend from Wyoming pointed out so correctly, the President himself?
It is, after all, called popularly ObamaCare. Even the President has embraced that name. You would think, I suspect, if there were a health care plan called EnziCare, the Senator from Wyoming would be happy to be covered by it and he would probably see very clearly that he would be willing and excited to be covered by.

What does it say that the people in charge of enforcing ObamaCare on the American people want out? They want a special rule. The IRS employee union president would be given the statutory responsibility of going to Americans, going to hard-working Americans and forcing Americans to comply with ObamaCare, have said in writing: Please, let us out of ObamaCare. We don't want to be a part of this thing. This is our health care you are talking about.

The most profound issue we are dealing with here today is not jobs, it is not the economy, it is not health care, it is not the government. The most profound issue we are dealing with here today is the fundamental divide between Washington and American people. There is a ruling class in Washington, DC; that they are subjected to different rules than the American people; that it is perfectly appropriate for political friends and allies of the President to get exemptions while single moms and young people and Hispanics and African Americans, people struggling, union workers struggling to pay the bills, and their kids— they don't get an exemption. Just those who walk the corridors of power. Just those with access to political influence.

You know what that does? It strengthens politicians even more. Look, politicians are in the business of granting dispensions, granting exceptions. That means everybody in the country who wants some exception better come to politicians and support them.

If you want to talk about something corrosive to our system of democracy, why do you think the American people hold this body in low regard? Because we pass laws that treat us better than everybody else. Tonight we are listening to the American people. We need to make DC listen.

By the way, I have been told that during the course of this filibuster, the “MakeDCListen” has at times been trending No. 1 in the country. I say to my colleagues and my friends who have come to the floor in support of this effort that it is because the American people understand and are frustrated as to why Washington doesn't listen to them, and for at least a brief moment each of us together—the Senator from Wyoming and the Senator from Oklahoma—are trying to serve as a voice for the American people who don't often have a voice in Washington. We need to make DC listen. There is nothing more important we can do than that.

Mr. INHOFE. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CRUZ. I am happy to yield for a question without yielding the floor.

Mr. INHOFE. A lot of people have forgotten the cost of this. I would like to go over a couple of things if it is all right with the Senator. First, I wonder if there is one thing happening in his State—which is one of the wealthiest in Oklahoma—of Texas that is happening in my State of Oklahoma. We are just a week away from when people will have to start signing up for ObamaCare. I commend Senator Cruz for reminding us all why this law is bad. He says there are two things that it doesn't have to be that way. We can stop it. There are still lingering questions about exactly what this is all going to look like.

We do know this. The President promised, as they call it, continues to be expensive and overreaching. When it started out, it didn’t sound too bad to the American people. It is estimated that the program will now cost as much as $2.4 trillion over 10 years.

As I have suggested to my friend from Texas, around here we know what $1 trillion is, but most people don’t know what that means. It is hard to understand this as far as what is going on with premiums. The administration is projecting that health care costs under the current IBM Medicare-eligible retiree plan options will nearly triple by 2020.

This is another letter from Riverside Cottages. I guess that is someplace in eastern Texas.

We were notified July 15, 2013 that my husband's insurance coverage, Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Oklahoma Comprehensive Health Association will terminate December 31, 2013. When my husband contacted Blue Cross Blue Shield, they told him that this policy will no longer exist due to ObamaCare. He will need to find new coverage.

And it goes on and on. The interesting thing—and the reason I am reading Texas letters right now—is that we receive a lot of them, and they are up in my office someplace. So this hits home and hits home hard. I ask my friend from Texas if he has received a lot of these anecdotal letters from people who are suffering serious hardships and are now anticipating what will happen when this becomes a reality?

Mr. CRUZ. I thank my friend from Oklahoma for his excellent question. Let me say from the outset that I am grateful for Senator INHOFE’s leadership. From the outset Senator INHOFE has been with me on this fight, fighting to defund ObamaCare.
I want to also note that Senator INHOFE, like some of the other Senators who have come to the floor of the Senate this afternoon—including Senator ROBERTS, Senator SESSIONS, and Senator ENZI—are respected veterans of this battle. They are leaders who have earned the respect of their colleagues.

I am grateful for Senator INHOFE being willing to stand up and be a leader in this fight. That courage is contagious and will continue to be even more contagious in the Republican Congress. I hope by the time we come to the cloture vote on Saturday, we will have 46 Republicans united in voting against shutting off the debate and against allowing majority leader HARRY REID the ability to fund ObamaCare with a straight 51 party vote.

Mr. INHOFE. Before that happens, I think it is important that the people of this country have to know what this is all about. This is socialized medicine. A lot of them didn’t believe that. Last week majority leader HARRY REID was on the PBS “Nevada Week in Review.” He was asked whether his goal was to move ObamaCare to a single-payer system. His answer was: Yes, yes. Absolutely yes. Do a lot of the people know what a single-payer system is? That is essentially socialized medicine.

I was around during the Clinton administration when there was a thing called Hillary health care. Does my friend from Texas remember Hillary health care?

Mr. CRUZ. I do indeed. I remember in particular at the time the press and all of the graybeards in Washington at the time saying that Hillary Care was unstoppable. It can’t stop it. Republicans need to get together.

If the Senator from Oklahoma will recall, initially the response was described as like Hillary care lite. Back then in the midst of the Hillary care fight there were a few courageous leaders in the House who stood up against Hillary. They came together and said that this was the American people rising. At the end of the day, it is the only thing that can win any fights.

Mr. INHOFE. That is exactly what did happen. I can remember going from Washington to my hometown of Tulsa. Normally I have to go through Chicago. Chicago is where the AMA has its headquarters, and it is probably still there. I will always remember this. I was coming back after the long fight against Hillary health care or socialized medicine. I remember saying the question on the Senate floor: Try to explain this to me: If socialized medicine doesn’t work in Great Britain or Canada, why would it work in this country? They never said it, but what they were thinking was: If I were running it, it would work. We got that point across.

They started way ahead with Hillary health care, and then we started to catch up. Just like now people are realizing this is a failed socialized medicine effort. We had won.

That kind of relates to what is happening today. I was on that plane going through Chicago to Tulsa, and I picked up the Wall Street Journal, and there was a full-page ad by the AMA supporting Hillary health care. Of course, when I stopped in Chicago, I went and visited the AMA. This many doctors’ organization that represents a lot of real smart doctors and others who were saying that we can’t win. We can’t win this and therefore let’s go ahead with it. We had already won when they ran that campaign. I do not think that any of them that put the ad in, but nonetheless we had won.

I don’t know if my friend remembers that because my friend was not in the Senate at that time. That is exactly what happened, and it is very analogous to a lot of things that are happening today.

The other thing I wanted to mention is that anytime desperation starts to set in, there are a lot of things that go round and round. Let me tell you what happened in Oklahoma today. This will surprise my friend from Texas. There are 14 people who started this—the Senator from Texas, myself, and 12 other people about 6 weeks ago. Some have been in lockstep to see what we could do to stop this from happening to my 20 kids and grandkids and the rest of America.

People realized I was there from the very beginning, as the Senator from Texas mentioned, and yet we have some of the Obama people who are doing robocalls in my State of Oklahoma posing as tea party people and saying to call INHOFE because he is for ObamaCare.

I say to my good friend, I can’t believe something like that is happening. It shows a level of desperation where they are trying to get people confused as to what the issue is and want to get to the American people past this and have this thing as a reality. Every liberal in America is probably for it.

Mr. CRUZ. I thank my friend from Oklahoma for that question. I have to say I am not surprised. There is an old adage among courtroom lawyers: If you have the facts, pound the facts. If you have the law, pound the law. If you don’t have either, pound the table.

To be honest, the approach by ObamaCare defenders is an awful lot of table pounding. It is an awful lot of “let’s discuss anything other than what, in fact, happened.” Pick up any newspaper and it is talking about this issue. What will the reporters, the political reporters in Washington, DC, write about? I think some may be frustrated because they wanted to be Hollywood gossip reporters because they covered these issues as a battle of personalities. If you want to get a story on the front page of the paper, find some anonymous congressional staffer to say something scurrilous, ideally include profanity in it, and the political reporters eat it up, because, apparently, the only thing that matters is the personalities bickering back and forth. In many ways, that is not surprising, because if one is trying to defend a law that the lead author calls a train wreck, that the unions who supported it are desperately trying to get it done, trying to talk about all the Democratic Senate colleagues are desperately asking for yourselves to be exempted from it, then you sure as heck don’t want to talk about how the law is operating. You sure as heck don’t want to talk about all the people who are losing their jobs because of ObamaCare. You sure as heck don’t want to talk about all the people who can’t get jobs, all the small businesses that aren’t growing because of ObamaCare. You certainly don’t want to talk about all of the people forced into part-time work, 29-hours-a-week work. You don’t want to talk about the insurance premiums that are going up, pricing people out of the insurance market, and you especially don’t want to talk about all the people losing their health insurance.

My colleague read the stories from East Texas of citizens there losing their health insurance. That is happening all over the country.

So it doesn’t surprise me that the Senator from Oklahoma is seeing robocalls in the State of Oklahoma because they don’t want to debate on the merits of ObamaCare because it is indefensible. So the only strategy is smoke and mirrors. The only strategy is, if we can’t talk about the law, let’s convince them about something else. Let’s distract them. Let’s figure out anything to take people’s minds off of the underlying issue.

I would note to my friend from Oklahoma, the only way that strategy works is if the American people don’t believe Washington will listen to them.

Look, there are a lot of reasons for this. Everyone thinks Washington is not going to listen to them. Washington is not going to listen to them because Washington hasn’t been listening to us for a long time. Politicians on both sides of this aisle have lost touch with their constituents. They don’t go home, don’t go to townhall meetings, and view the desires of their constituents as simply uninformed and not relevant to doing our jobs.

Mr. INHOFE. If the Senator from Texas will yield, because he said something that is important.

Mr. CRUZ. I am yielding for a question but not yielding the floor.

Mr. INHOFE. Of course. The Senator from Texas said if you don’t have logic on your side or the facts on your side, you talk about public on your side, what do you do? It is not just pounding the table. It is name-calling.

I went through this. I would suggest to my friend, 12 years ago when the Kyoto treaty was up and everyone thought global warming was coming, the first thing the Americans did was this: We went on one’s trip to the White House to support global warming, until we realized what the cost would be. I was the bad guy
because I stood and said: No, this isn’t true. First of all, it is a hoax; and secondly, even if it is not, we couldn’t do it. That is when all the name-calling started. I can remember being called—in writing and by a fairly prominent person—I should be hanged for treason at that time. That is what I felt, and that is what my friend is going through right now with a lot of people who don’t agree with him.

Twelve years later, what has happened? People realize it was right. I am not suggesting it is going to be 12 years before they realize the Senator from Texas is right on this, but it means the behavior of people today is something that has happened many times in the past.

So I would just ask my friend to remember that and to realize that quite often, when a person is right on a controversial issue, they are going to be the subject of a lot of criticism, a lot of cussing, a lot of name-calling, and a lot of vitriol, but the fact is it is truly awesome, in the real sense of inspiring awe—I will know that at the end of the day—listen, the Senator from Oklahoma and I, and all 100 of us, are incredibly fortunate. We have lived in this country of relative privilege. We, everyone in the Senate, enjoy a good home, has a soft bed, I suspect, has air-conditioning, has food on the table. I feel blessed to have a wife who is my best friend in the world and whom I love with all my heart, to have two precious little girls who are the joy of my life. To be able to come to work every day, to walk on this Senate floor, there is not a day that when doesn’t take my breath away. The idea that the son of a Cuban immigrant with nothing, who finds himself suddenly elected to the Senate, to have the opportunity to come in every day, it is truly awesome, in the real sense of the word. There was a time when the word ‘awesome’ was a Valley girl phrase, but awesome in its real sense of inspiring awe—I will tell my colleague I find it awesome every day to walk into this Capitol and to have the amazing privilege to serve, as the Senator from Oklahoma and I do, as do all 100 of us. The slings and arrows one deals with serving in public office, to be perfectly candid, are all chicken feed.

The old phrase about sticks and stones—listen, someone saying something mean about another is nothing compared to the suffering that so many people across this country are experiencing.

I sat down with one single mom who is working her heart out to provide for her kids because she wants her kids to have a good home, she wants her kids to have an education, she wants her kids to have a future. Her hours have been reduced to 29 hours a week and she doesn’t know what is coming next. That is hard work. That is suffering. This isn’t nothing.

The Senator from Oklahoma speaks with disabled veterans, as I know he has done many times, and he is worried about the impact of ObamaCare on our economy, of jobs drying up. He is worried about his grandson who is just coming out of school right now but who can’t get a job. That is a lot more important than the political bickering back and forth. That was my point about all of the press coverage dealing with—it is not about any personality here; it is about listening to the American people.

The American people do not give a flying flip about any Member of the Senate. It is not about the decision that the American people are interested in is what we have always been interested in, which is freedom, our families, providing for our kids, being a good example to our kids, working for a better world and working at our kids and their kids have a even better future and opportunity than we have had. If we go back centuries, we see that every generation of Americans has been able to give to the next generation a brighter future, greater prosperity, greater opportunity. The American people are the first generation of Americans not to do so. If we want to put our fingers on the discontent so many Americans feel, that goes right to the heart of it: What we are doing in Washington isn’t working.

The economic malaise. I refer to the last 5 years as the ‘great stagnation’ because for 4 consecutive years our economy has grown on average 0.9 percent a year. It is not working. Intelligent, rational people looking at a set of policies that aren’t working would do the intelligent, rational thing. We would correct course. We would say, OK, this isn’t working. What has worked? But that is not happening. It is not happening because even though it is not working, the failures aren’t visited on Congress. The failures are visited on the American people.

The last quote I read was:

"...the impact of ObamaCare on our economy, of jobs drying up. He is worried about his grandson who is just coming out of school right now but who can’t get a job. That is a lot more important than the political bickering back and forth. That was my point about all of the press coverage dealing with—it is not about any personality here; it is about listening to the American people. The American people do not give a flying flip about any Member of the Senate. It is not about the decision that the American people are interested in is what we have always been interested in, which is freedom, our families, providing for our kids, being a good example to our kids, working for a better world and working at our kids and their kids have a even better future and opportunity than we have had. If we go back centuries, we see that every generation of Americans has been able to give to the next generation a brighter future, greater prosperity, greater opportunity. The American people are the first generation of Americans not to do so. If we want to put our fingers on the discontent so many Americans feel, that goes right to the heart of it: What we are doing in Washington isn’t working."

According to a recent Pew Research Study, 56 percent of 18- to 24-year-olds lived with their parents in 2012, up from 51 percent in 2007.

Fifty-six percent of 18- to 24-year-olds lived with their parents in 2012—an increase that looks particularly dramatic because the share had changed little in the previous four decades.

Moreover, many young people are losing hopes of matching the prosperity of their parents again.

I talked a minute ago about the hope of all of us that our kids have greater opportunity. What does it say that young people are losing hope of even matching where we are, much less having greater prosperity?

Just 11 percent of employed young people in a recent Pew survey said they had a career as opposed to “just a job”; fewest than half said they were even on track for one. John Connelly thought he was on the right track in life. The son of a New Jersey auto mechanic, he was the first in his family to go to college when he enrolled in Rutgers in 2007.

I will note as an aside, my uncle went to Rutgers. I went to college, to Princeton in New Jersey, and my uncle was often fond of reminding me that the very first collegiate football game that ever was played in the United States was played between Rutgers and Princeton. At every Thanksgiving, my uncle would then remind me who won and it was Rutgers who won. Princeton
Mr. CRUZ. I thank the Senator for the question, and I thank the Senator for the comment he has made in public, noting that having attended the schools I have that perhaps I had not learned to count to 60. I will note that I am quite familiar with what is necessary to defund ObamaCare. What I have said for months is this is a long process. I am not remotely Pollyannaish. I am not remotely under the illusion that this is going to be a short or quick process. I am suddenly assuming ObamaCare will be defunded.

I am getting to the answer to the Senator’s question, but it is a detailed answer, so if he will forgive me, I will take a few moments to lay it out.

In my view, the first step to this process was unifying and motivating the American people. This process was never going to work unless the American people became engaged in historic numbers. So I spent much of the month of August and September during our recess traveling the State of Texas, traveling the country, doing everything I could to go directly to the American people, to go around the lobbyists, to go around the entrenched interests in Washington and go straight to the American people.

I will tell the Senator, the response was incredible. Everywhere I would go, I would see 1,000, 2,000 people show up. We have seen over 1.6 million Americans sign a national petition to defund ObamaCare.

That was the first step. That was not going to be enough, but it was a critical first step.

The second step was what happened last week. It was the House of Representatives voting to defund ObamaCare.

I would note, as the Senator from Illinois is well aware, that as recently as a couple weeks ago, every learned observer, every pundit, everyone in Washington said: It is impossible that the House is going to pass a continuing resolution that defunds ObamaCare. It is not going to happen. Yet on Friday it did. Why did it pass? Because the House of Representatives listened to the American people. The Speaker of the House and House conservatives stood and did the right thing and made a courageous vote. I will note, two Democrats joined the House Republicans in that vote.

Mr. CRUZ. Will the Senator yield further for a question?

Mr. DURBIN. Will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. CRUZ. Sure.

Mr. DURBIN. I might question the Senator’s premise that if we go to 60 Republicans we are the majority.

Mr. CRUZ. I would like to finish answering the Senator’s last question, which I am happy to do.

But let me finish answering the Senator’s question.

The third step is where we are now as the Senate. In the Senate, we are going to have to do two things. The first thing is we are going to have to do in order to successfully defund ObamaCare is to unify Republicans, to bring together all 46 Republicans, opposing cloture, opposing Harry Reid being able to fund ObamaCare on a straight 51-vote partisan vote. I believe every Republican should be unified in that. Right now we are not. Right now there are divisions in the Republican caucus. I am hopeful Republicans will listen to our constituents. I cannot convince my colleagues. The only people who can convince my colleagues on this side of the aisle or that side of the aisle are the people all of us work for, the American people.

If we are able to unify Republicans, the next step—the Senator asked me: How do we ultimately get to 60? I assume the predicate of that question is that the first thing we would have to do is to get to 51—so if we got 46 Republicans and we initially got five Democrats. How would we get five more?

Mr. DURBIN. The Senator has spoken today about hard-working Democrats. The Senator met in southern Illinois. The Senator did—was illustrated by a woman whom he ken at length many times, including today, about his education. I respect him. He has gone to some very famous schools. Certainly, the Senator understands it takes 60 votes to achieve the goal he is trying to achieve, which means the Senator believes he has at least all the votes on his side of the aisle and another 14 votes on the Democratic side of the aisle to repeal ObamaCare. Does the Senator have that belief?

Mr. CRUZ. I thank the Senator for that question, and I thank the Senator for the comment he has made in public, noting that having attended the schools I have that perhaps I had not learned to count to 60. I will note that I am quite familiar with what is necessary to defund ObamaCare. What I have said for months is this is a long process. I am not remotely Pollyannaish. I am not remotely under the illusion that this is going to be a short or quick process. I am suddenly assuming ObamaCare will be defunded.

I am getting to the answer to the Senator’s question, but it is a detailed answer, so if he will forgive me, I will take a few moments to lay it out.

In my view, the first step to this process was unifying and motivating the American people. This process was never going to work unless the American people became engaged in historic numbers. So I spent much of the month of August and September during our recess traveling the State of Texas, traveling the country, doing everything I could to go directly to the American people, to go around the lobbyists, to go around the entrenched interests in Washington and go straight to the American people.

I will tell the Senator, the response was incredible. Everywhere I would go, I would see 1,000, 2,000 people show up. We have seen over 1.6 million Americans sign a national petition to defund ObamaCare.

That was the first step. That was not going to be enough, but it was a critical first step.

The second step was what happened last week. It was the House of Representatives voting to defund ObamaCare.

I would note, as the Senator from Illinois is well aware, that as recently as a couple weeks ago, every learned observer, every pundit, everyone in Washington said: It is impossible that the House is going to pass a continuing resolution that defunds ObamaCare. It is not going to happen. Yet on Friday it did. Why did it pass? Because the House of Representatives listened to the American people. The Speaker of the House and House conservatives stood and did the right thing and made a courageous vote. I will
can imagine—a cook, a waitress, a housekeeper, all of these things. She is 62 years old. Judy told me that she had never had health insurance one day in her life, ever. She worked every single day she could, but she never had health insurance. It turns out Judy was diabetic, and Medicaid does not cover some diabetes medicines.

We have just had an announcement in Illinois that is going to be officially released tomorrow about what this new health insurance marketplace in Illinois means for people such as Judy. It means we are going to offer 165 different health insurance plans in Illinois by eight different insurers. The premiums at the lowest level of health insurance, for those who are not under Medicaid, will be in the range of $84 a month. But the good news for Judy is that her income is so low she now qualifies for Medicaid for the first time in her life. For the first time in her life, Judy who would be turned down because of a preexisting condition of diabetes, is going to have the peace of mind of health insurance.

The Senator and I are blessed to have the best health insurance in America as Members of the Senate. So when the Senator says he wants to disband and stop ObamaCare, does he want to deny the opportunity for Judy and millions more just like her for the first time in their lives to have the protection of health insurance they can afford? Mr. CRUZ. I thank the Senator from Illinois for that question. I will say. I respect his sincerity and passion in believing that government solutions from Washington can fix this problem. I do not know if the Senator from Illinois shares the view that Majority Leader Reid expressed on television. I do not know if his objective is as Majority Leader Reid said his was: to move to single-payer, government-provided, socialized health care. But it may be. I do not want to put words in the Senator’s mouth. But I do not know the way or the other what his view would be.

Mr. DURBIN. Thank you.

Mr. CRUZ. But I will say this. The Senator tells the story of Judy. The best way for Judy or anyone to have health insurance is to have an economy that is booming where people can get jobs and have opportunities. Indeed, let me respond with two things.

No. 1, before the Senator from Illinois came to the floor of the Senate, I read a number of letters that have come from people all over the country. Let me just read the next one in my stack because it happens to actually be a counterpart to his story about Judy. This is a constituent from Brackenridge, TX, who wrote earlier this year:

Since the passage of what is known as ObamaCare, my insurance premiums have gone up three times. That doesn’t count the increases in my Medicare Part A and B. That has also risen. I was also informed prior to passage that certain retirees from one group would see their company support terminated after 2013 and my support will terminate after 2018. In the meantime, I’ve lost two family doctors who have left the practice and must find new general practitioners and physician assistants. I am fortunate to have good coverage, for which I pay dearly, that is accepted everywhere; but I fear the day I have to go to that emergency room and all of the costs of the Obama’s train wreck ever since the bill was passed. Surely, there must be some way to defund or repeal the bill. Please help.

I would note for the Senator from Illinois, these ideas for help are coming from all across the country.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the Senator yield for another question? Mr. CRUZ. I am happy to yield for a question without yielding the floor.

Mr. DURBIN. I think the Senator’s answer to Judy is: You need a better job. After working a lifetime—62 years, hard work, the best she can do; she has never had health insurance—and I think the Senator’s answer was: Judy, get a better job.

So let me ask another question.

When I voted for ObamaCare, health care reform, one of the things that motivated me was the fact that health insurance companies would no longer be able to discriminate against those Americans with preexisting conditions. I have had a situation in my family, a child who had a serious physical problem, who could not have qualified but for group health insurance that was available to me as a Member of Congress. If I had gone in the open market to buy a policy, I am not sure I would have bought one for my family to cover my child.

So when the Senator says he wants to abolish ObamaCare, does he want to abolish that part of ObamaCare which says you cannot discriminate against people with preexisting conditions when it comes to health insurance? If those people are victims of asthma, diabetes, cancer treatment, mental illness, does the Senator want to abolish ObamaCare and that protection? Mr. CRUZ. I thank the Senator from Illinois for that question.

Let me answer it in two different ways. Let me talk generally about what the Senator talked about, about his health insurance and my health insurance as a Member of the Senate and let me talk about preexisting conditions separately.

The first point I will make is that the Senator from Illinois is passionate and has been quite eloquent describing what he perceives to be the benefits from ObamaCare. Yet I think it speaks volumes that the Senator from Illinois and I and every other Member of Congress have been uncompromisingly against President Obama from the plain text of the statute.

The statute provided—and it was inserted quite deliberately—if we are going to impose rules on the American people, we should be subject to the same rules that would be put in the exchanges similar to millions of other Americans. The Senator just talked about the wonderful exchange. The text of ObamaCare provides that he and I should be in those exchanges. It also provides that, just like the other people in the exchange, our employers cannot subsidize it once we get in that exchange.

Once it passed into law, the Democratic caucus met with President Obama. Obviously, I was not in that meeting. But I read the public reports of what occurred there. I read the press accounts. The press accounts all indicated that the majority leader and the Democratic Members of the Senate asked President Obama: Please get us out from under this. We do not want to be in the exchanges.

I see my friend from Illinois is shaking his head. I was not in the room. The press reports all say that is what happened. But regardless, that is what happened.

So that message was heard by the President because shortly thereafter the administration issued a ruling that exempted Members of Congress and exempted our staff.

I am curious, if the Senator from Illinois is such a fan of the exchanges, is such a fan of the health care that has been provided to Judy, would the Senator from Illinois for that question. I would note for the Senator from Illinois, the VITTER’s amendment to provide that every Member of Congress, every one of our staffs, every political appointee in the Obama administration—and, frankly, I would like to see every Federal employee put under the exchanges—so if we are going to make the rules for the American people, that we be subject to those same rules, those same plans, so that when we go on television and say the exchanges are very good, we are not talking about something someone else is experiencing, we are talking about our own health care.

Mr. DURBIN. If the Senator would yield, I would like to respond and ask a question.

Mr. CRUZ. I am happy to yield for a question without yielding the floor.

Mr. DURBIN. The point I would like to make is that the Senator is just plain wrong. What he has stated is just plain wrong. Here is the state of the situation: The health insurance that you enjoy and the Senator from Alabama and I enjoy, as well as the Senator from Virginia, is the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program. It covers 8 million Federal employees and their families, including Members of Congress and our staff. The premiums we pay for the health insurance we choose—the Federal Government as our employer pays 72 percent of the premiums. This is not an unusual situation—150 million Americans, which is half of our population, have exactly the same arrangement. These are employer-sponsored employer contributions to the health care of their employees.

What the President did was to say, No. 1, that you, Senator Cruz, I, and others will now have to buy our health insurance through the insurance exchanges that we created in ObamaCare.
With it, we will get the employer contribution, as we do now—as you enjoy now personally and I enjoy—for that purchase of health insurance.

My wife and I will be choosing a policy from the health insurance marketplace of Illinois. We have 8 different insurance companies and 165 choices. That is our insurance.

What you quarrel with is the employer contribution to health insurance. If that is now your position and the position of Senator Vitter and the Republican Party, that it is a Federal subsidy which should be stopped, you are affecting the health insurance not just of Members of Congress and their staff but 150 million Americans. You better think twice about this. If you want to stop employer contributions to health insurance, that will be the headline for tomorrow morning. I do not support that. My question is, Do you?

Mr. CRUZ. I thank the Senator from Illinois for his extremely genuine political advice and counsel. I would note that the experience Democratic Senators found under ObamaCare of suddenly facing the prospect of losing their health insurance, of being forced into the exchanges, health insurance that is more expensive, and suddenly being forced into the exchanges with no employer subsidy, is a disconcerting experience. It is an experience nobody liked. It is an experience that is lousy. There is a reason why Democratic Senators found under ObamaCare of suddenly facing the prospect of losing their health insurance, of being forced into the exchanges, health insurance that is more expensive, and suddenly being forced into the exchanges with no employer subsidy, is a disconcerting experience. It is an experience nobody liked. It is an experience that is lousy.

There is a reason why Democratic Senators found under ObamaCare of suddenly facing the prospect of losing their health insurance, of being forced into the exchanges, health insurance that is more expensive, and suddenly being forced into the exchanges with no employer subsidy, is a disconcerting experience. It is an experience nobody liked. It is an experience that is lousy. There is a reason why congressional staff were so upset.

What my friend from Illinois is not focusing on is that right now there are Americans all over this country who are experiencing that same exact sentiment because of ObamaCare. Just a few weeks ago UPS sent a letter to some 15,000 employees saying: We are dropping spousal health insurance because of ObamaCare. That is 15,000 UPS employees who had insurance for their husbands, and suddenly, and suddenly those husbands and wives are left without health insurance and being told: Go on an exchange with no employer subsidy. Senator DURBIN just made a passionate case for why that is a terrible subsidy. Senator DURBIN just made a passionate case for why the experience Democratic Senators found under ObamaCare of suddenly facing the prospect of losing their health insurance, of being forced into the exchanges, health insurance that is more expensive, and suddenly being forced into the exchanges with no employer subsidy, is a disconcerting experience. It is an experience nobody liked. It is an experience that is lousy. There is a reason why congressional staff were so upset.

What my friend from Illinois is not focusing on is that right now there are Americans all over this country who are experiencing that same exact sentiment because of ObamaCare. Just a few weeks ago UPS sent a letter to some 15,000 employees saying: We are dropping spousal health insurance because of ObamaCare. That is 15,000 UPS employees who had insurance for their husbands, and suddenly, and suddenly those husbands and wives are left without health insurance and being told: Go on an exchange with no employer subsidy. Senator DURBIN just made a passionate case for why that is a terrible subsidy. Senator DURBIN just made a passionate case for why the experience Democratic Senators found under ObamaCare of suddenly facing the prospect of losing their health insurance, of being forced into the exchanges, health insurance that is more expensive, and suddenly being forced into the exchanges with no employer subsidy, is a disconcerting experience. It is an experience nobody liked. It is an experience that is lousy. There is a reason why congressional staff were so upset.

So I do think the extent to which we as Senators go into the exchange and are guaranteed the full subsidy we have been getting—that is different from what is going to happen to millions of Americans. I guess the Senator maybe has heard that argument and how it is possible that if businesses decide to drop health care, individuals can then be forced to go into the exchange without any subsidy at all. I would ask Senator DURBIN if he understands that is possibly what could happen to large numbers of Americans.

Mr. CRUZ. I think the Senator from Alabama is exactly right. We are seeing Americans all over this country hurt by ObamaCare.

I want to suggest that the problem we are debating today is bigger than this continuing resolution, it is bigger than ObamaCare, and it is bigger even than the Senate procedures. The problem is that the men and women of DC are not listening. They are not listening to the millions of Americans who are asking for more accountability, more responsibility, and more truth from their elected officials. It is time to make DC listen.

I would observe that during the course of this afternoon, the hashtag ‘‘MakeDCListen’’ has been trending No. 1 because the American people are frustrated. They are frustrated that the Senate is not listening to them. They are frustrated that the Republican Senators are not listening to them. The whole debate we are having right now is not about strategy, it is not about process, it is not about procedures, and it is not about all of the pundits and pollsters and consultants. The problem is that DC is not listening.

Everyone in America knows that ObamaCare is destroying jobs. What the Senator from Alabama so eloquently talked about, the econometric predictions—you have to get outside the beltway to any of the 50 States and actually talk to people who are trying to find jobs and talk to small business owners who are struggling under the 20,000 pages of regulations. Everyone in America knows ObamaCare is destroying jobs and driving up health care costs.

Let me encourage right now everyone in America—President Obama 3 1⁄2 years ago promised the average American that by the end of his first term, by the end of last year, the average American family’s premiums would drop $2,500. Let me encourage everyone in America whose premiums dropped $2,500 to go online and tweet ‘‘ObamaCare cut my premium.’’ You know what. I am willing to venture that in every one of these States, if all of the Democratic Senators who support ObamaCare are making that public they are willing to say ‘‘I will take only the votes of those of you whose premiums have gone down.’’ I can tell you right now on the Republican side that I will happily take the votes of everybody else because I am going to predict that if you are going to be successful, it is not even going to be a 60-40 election. Everyone knows this thing is not working, and Washington is pretending it does not know. This process is rigged. That is why we have to make DC listen.

In traveling across Texas, just like the Senator traveling across Alabama, I hear the stories everywhere I go. It does not matter what town I am in, it does not matter whom I am talking to, I hear the same story. I hear that people with disabilities saying: Please stop ObamaCare before I lose my health insurance. I see young people who would like to be working toward a career saying: Please, I would like a job.

I met with a whole bunch of service men and women who had just come back from Afghanistan at a military base in Texas. I asked them, as I try do in any gathering that is a small enough group that I can do this: Go around, share an issue that is weighing on your heart, that you pray about, that you are concerned about.

I remember one young soldier said: I am most worried about jobs. When I come out of the military, am I going to have a job? All of my buddies, when they come out, they cannot find jobs. Everyone nodded and said: That is exactly right.

The American people want to stop this madness. So do I.

Everyone in Washington we pass million-dollar bills and billion-dollar bills no one has ever read, without even voting on them. We call it unanimous consent.
It is only unanimous because we do not let the American people know. It would be very interesting to bring 100 of our constituents in on any unanimous consent that is spending $1 billion here, $1 billion there, and see what our constituents think about that. The system is designed deliberately to hide what we are doing.

In this debate right now there are many Members of this body who are happy that the debate is covered with obscurity over pressure, obscurity over a move that we feel gratitude for being a move to proceed. Nobody knows what that is. You know what. That benefits Members of this body because it lets all 100 go back to their citizens and say: What were you for? Yeah, yeah, I was for that because I was for the motion to whatchamacallit.

No one understands what that is. You know, one of the things we see is our leaders demand approval for bills before they are amended. So we are being asked today or even tomorrow to vote to shut off debate on this bill before we know what the bill will be. We do not know what amendment HARRY REID is going to file, but we are asked to cut off debate nonetheless. It is like forming the House the way NANCY PELOSI when she said: Pass it to find out what is in it. You wonder why the American people are disgusted with what happens in Washington. That is business as usual in this town.

Listen, the way this is planned to unfold is very simple. Majority Leader Reid has said that if he succeeds in cloture, if he succeeds in shutting off debate on Friday or Saturday, that he is going to introduce one amendment—and by all appearances only one amendment—to fund ObamaCare in its entirety. That will be subject to a straight 51-vote threshold.

There are a couple of dynamics going on. No. 1, Republicans are actively debating among themselves: Should Republicans vote with HARRY REID and Senate Democrats to allow HARRY REID and Senate Democrats to fund ObamaCare with a straight 51-vote partisan majority? I do not find that a difficult question. I think that should unify all 46 Republicans to say no. We should not enable ObamaCare to be funded, and a vote for cloture on Friday or Saturday is a vote to fund ObamaCare. They are one in the same. They are identical.

If the Republicans gave that power to HARRY REID to fund ObamaCare, then you are responsible for it being funded—and, by the way, for it being funded in the same broken process where there are no amendments, there is no opportunity to change it, there is no opportunity to offer anything. The Presiding Officer will not have an opportunity to offer an amendment, and I will not have an opportunity to offer an amendment. Instead, it is brute political force.

But I will tell of an upside—an upside, frankly, from some Members of the Republican caucus. If debate is cut off, they can tell their constituents: I voted for the House bill. That is not true, but they can tell them that. But even better, a 51-vote threshold—here is the dirty little secret people do not want to admit: There are more than a few Republicans on this side who affirmatively want a 51-vote threshold on funding ObamaCare. Why? Because they want two outcomes. No. 1, if we have a 51-vote threshold on funding ObamaCare, I promise you all 46 Republicans will vote against it. It will be a symbolic vote. This means every Republican can go back to their district and say: Mr. and Mrs. America, when I had the opportunity to vote against ObamaCare, I did it. I did what you wanted.

I did what you want. The rest of it is kind of hidden in the procedural mumbo jumbo. But the beautiful outcome—and the reason why some Republicans want a 51-vote threshold—is if it is 51 votes we will lose. The President says: Republicans, you have to come together. If you have 51 Democrats in this body. It will be a partisan party-line Democratic vote, exactly how ObamaCare got passed into law.

I am going to suggest that Republicans are lining up along and saying we want a symbolic vote is not listening to the people. Look, the dysfunction is on both sides. The Democratic Members of this Chamber—I understand, look, ObamaCare is a Democratic law passed and signed into law by a Democratic President, passed into law with only Democratic votes.

It is hard, if you are a political party, to admit, gosh, this thing that we put a lot of political capital in, it ain’t working. That is a difficult, risky thing for anyone to say.

I am going to encourage—and my hope is that by the end of this process we will see some Democrats, Senate Democrats, listen to their voters and say it is the right thing to do. I thought this thing would work, I hoped it would work, but it hasn’t. That is what the unions have said. The labor unions that publicly, vocally supported ObamaCare—and many of them were active proponents of getting it passed—have looked at it and said: Do you know what, we thought it would work and it hasn’t.

There is no shame in admitting you tried something and it didn’t work. I very much hope over the course of this debate we can convince some Democratic Senators doing so. I would note that the fact that Senate Democrats are not participating, are not here, makes it less likely. But on the Republican side, the game is the same.

Washington, DC, is a strange place in many regards, one of which is symbolic votes are treated as tremendously important. I am told of a conversation that Senator LEE had with a Member of the House when early on the House had not yet voted to defund ObamaCare, but there were questions about casting a symbolic vote to do so. The American people were quite unhappy with that and expressed that view.

Both Senator LEE and I expressed the view that we shouldn’t be engaging in procedural games; we should actually be defunding ObamaCare. One particular House Member who will remain unnamed called Senator LEE and made a comment that I thought was particularly odd, Washington view of things. Why would we feel gratitude for being a move that is offered in such a way that HARRY REID, on a party-line vote, can fund ObamaCare, and yet we can all have a symbolic vote. That is the reason, frankly, is that this is a town where for a long time neither side has listened to the team. This is the town where for a long time there have been elected politicians who want symbolic votes.

Let me be very clear. I will not want a symbolic vote on anything. I think everyone—our constituents should know what we believe. Whether or not we get a vote on it to demonstrate it shouldn’t matter, because if we are standing and fighting, and if we are walking the walk, our beliefs should be self-evident.

DC responds, the DC establishment responds, if anybody tries to tell the truth—look, I promise you, my observations right now that there are some Republicans that would like a symbolic vote and then would like to lose so that they don’t have any risk of it actually being defunded, I promise you those comments are not getting me invited to any cocktail parties in Washington anytime soon. That is perfectly fine. I don’t particularly enjoy cocktail parties anyway.

This town needs a lot more truth telling. It is absolutely true. Everyone here knows it, but we are not supposed to say it out loud. Where we kind of wink at each other and say, listen, you are telling your constituents one thing, I am telling my constituents one thing. Let’s not bother to give them the opportunity to know the truth.

If we got 100 of your constituents or mine, if we got 100 citizens from any of the 50 States and we put them in this room instead of 100 Senators, I promise you, No. 1, our constituents would not be invited to any cocktail parties. They don’t actually change the country. They don’t make the lives of people better. But they do help politicians who want to get reelected and want to run a campaign ad saying, here is what I voted to do.

If you have 100 citizens in the Commonwealth of Virginia, the great State of Texas, the great State of Alabama, what would they say on ObamaCare is,
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we have to fix this. We have to get people back to work. We have to deal with all the young people that are stuck in dead-end jobs because they can’t get a job coming out of school. We have to deal with all the people, all single moms working in diners who are finding themselves working 29 hours a week because of ObamaCare. We have to deal with all of the people who are struggling because their health insurance premiums are skyrocketing under ObamaCare. We have to do everything we can to make DC listen. What is that fight about? It is about making DC listen to the American people. I very much hope that the debate over the course of this week has a real effect changing the culture. That is why this body has held 10, 12, 14 percent approval ratings.

I remember months ago when all of us were in the Old Senate Chamber, all 100 Senators. It was a bipartisan meeting, and it was actually a very interesting, productive conversation. I remember a number of Senators commenting about the low approval ratings that Congress has and saying something to the effect that it is because we are not more efficient, that we don’t pass more laws.

I have to say that I think that gets it exactly backward. I have never once found any constituent in the State of Texas—and I suspect there are not many in your State, in my State, or in anyone else’s State—who says the problem is you guys aren’t passing enough laws. That is not what I hear from people.

It is what you hear from politicians in Washington who would like to pass as many laws as possible so they can take credit for them. But it is not what you hear from people. The people at home say: You guys have done enough damage already. I will tell you why I think we are held in such low esteem. It is because we don’t listen to the American people.

In every poll that has been done for years of the American people, in any State, whether your State, my State, any State, even bright blue States, Democratic States, if you ask the American people what is their top priority—what is the overwhelming answer? This is true if you ask Republicans, even if you ask only Democrats. If you ask only Democrats in bright blue States, jobs and the economy are still the top priority—or independents, Libertarians, anyone in the United States.

Yet the Presiding Officer and I have both served in this body 9 months. I would note the 9 months we have been here the Senate has spent virtually zero time talking about jobs and the economy. It is not on the agenda. We don’t talk about it. We spent 6 weeks talking about guns, talking about taking away people’s Second Amendment right, and no time talking about fundamental tax reform, fundamental regulatory reform. Today we are talking about defunding ObamaCare, the biggest job killer in the country. If you want to get jobs and the economy going, there is nothing we could do more important than defunding ObamaCare.

What is the case? There are right now three Members of the Senate on the floor of the Senate and two Members of the House of Representatives. Ask the American people, how many Senators should be here in the debate over defunding ObamaCare, the biggest job killer in this country? Because the American people’s top priority is jobs and the economy, the people would say to all 100 Senators, what possibly do you have that is more important to do?

I expect some of my colleagues are at a fundraising dinner. Some of our colleagues are at home with their families.

Do you want to know why Congress is held in such low esteem? It is not that we don’t pass enough laws; it is that the priorities of the men and women in Washington don’t match the priorities of the men and women in America. We are not listening to America.

The most important objective, what I hope will come of this week, more important than continuing resolution and the budget, more important than ObamaCare, is that we make some real progress to changing the culture of this place so that both Democrats and Republicans start listening to the people. That is the fundamental problem here, and that is why this debate is so important. Right now, unfortunately, it is not how it is working.

Mr. SESSIONS. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CRUZ. I yield for a question without yielding the floor.

Mr. SESSIONS. The Senator made an important point about too often what goes on around here is that we have to obscure the reality of what is happening in the real world. I wish to ask about it. The Senator asked Senator DURBIN—I didn’t see exactly how he answered. I think the Senator asked him whether or not he believes in a single payer. I don’t think he answered. We know for a fact, though, that Senator REID in August said, when squarely asked: Do you believe in a single payer, he said: Yes, yes, absolutely yes.

What we have learned since then is that others are making the same statement. This spring, Senator SANDERS of Vermont, a nice and able Senator in the Budget Committee, said this bill is not going to work; really, in my view, it is not going to work; it needs to be a single payer.

Senator SANDERS is one of our more liberal Members—and I think it was how he identified himself, as a socialist—but he is an honest, able advocate. He said the truth; this bill, as written, will not work. It has to be a single payer.

Only this afternoon in the Budget Committee, one of our esteemed Members of the Democratic Party, when asked—when I made a comment about Senator REID, that the majority leader of the Senate said he wanted a single payer—he said, this ought to be a single payer system.

I don’t know how many others have. The President said, in 2003, when he was running, he flat out said he wanted to have a single payer. Then he backed off and began to obscure that position, it seems to me. It seems to me that they realize that the American people are not there and the government take over health care. So what did they do? It seemed to me that they obscured what the reality of this legislation was. They began to move away from it, and they began to say that it was something that it wasn’t.

In the last few days it is almost like they have come out here in the open and begun to say that is what should happen. I understand the Democratic leader in the House, NANCY PELOSI, has said that she favors a single-payer system.

I think I will say to Senator CRUZ that I feel you are doing important work because the American people may not yet fully know how huge an issue it is. I take this Congress very seriously.

Let me ask again, when we say there is a single payer—hair begins to stand up on my neck—I think I know who the payer is. Who would be the single payer? Who would be the single payer for all health care in America if that kind of agenda had been passed?

Mr. CRUZ. I thank Senator SESSIONS for that very important question. The payer would be the U.S. Government, which means the payer would be the U.S. taxpayer, which means the payer would be hard-working Americans, once the Federal Government starts paying for all health care in all of America, which has been the stated position of the far left for a long, long time.

The Senator from Alabama made reference to Senator BERNIE SANDERS. I agree. I respect Senator SANDERS’s commitment to his principles. As you know, he previously ran as a socialist. That is correct. I respect that degree of candor. Quite frankly, I would be very happy if this body had 10 more BERNIE SANDERS and 10 more MIKE LEEs, because I think there would be far more truth in advertising and then we could have real debate about what the role of government should play in our lives.

Should we have socialized medicine? That is a very good debate to have, especially because—and I know the Senator from Alabama agrees with me on this—the facts are on our side. In every country on Earth where socialized medicine has been implemented it hasn’t worked. We know what the results are. If you implement socialized medicine, you inevitably see poor quality. You see rationing, you see scarcity. You see the government getting what it paid for, and you and I and the government deciding you want a health treatment, your mother wants a health treatment, your child needs a health
treatment. And you have a government bureaucrat deciding whether you get one. Maybe the bureaucrat tells you: Well, you can get that hip replacement you want in 6 months, in 1 year. But they may turn to Senator LEE and say: You know what? Your month can’t get that treatment. We have determined in our tables it doesn’t make sense to give her that treatment. I guess she is at the end of her road.

That is what happens. It is the govern- ment bureaucrats who decide who gets healthcare and who doesn’t. And you know what. Americans overwhelmingly don’t want that. This is another point that is critical. It is not just that Majority Leader Reid said he likes single-payer socialized health care; it is that he says, and a number of others have, that ObamaCare is designed to lead to that. I think it is very important to ask the question: Why? How does it lead to that? Because that goes to both sides of the aisle.

There are many Republicans who have said: We shouldn’t fight this fight. It is risky. We will get political blame. All of the DC pundits say we shouldn’t do this. Let’s sit quietly and let ObamaCare collapse. It is collapsing of its own weight. It is not working. If we sit quietly, it will collapse and the Democrats will take the blame. I am suggesting there is far too much worry about blame and credit. Who cares? I don’t care if Democrats take the blame. I would prefer to avoid the col- lapse and spare the Democrats the blame. Who cares?

But if it collapses, why is it that Major- ity Leader Reid says ObamaCare will lead to single payer? Because in the process of the collapse, it will take our private health insurance system with it. Yes, it will collapse, but it will leave a wreckage. It will leave millions of people losing their health insurance, being pushed more and more into the exchange where the insurer faces the other pushed out of the market. So when it collapses, there is no private health insurance market to go back to. That is why Majority Leader Reid can tell the American people: Hey, I want the single-payer socialized medicine. And relax, ObamaCare will take us to that.

But that is also a real message to all the Republicans who right now have not yet announced they are going to oppose this bill. Because if we wait for ObamaCare to collapse—yes, it will collapse—with it will go the private health insurance system, and we may find ourselves in single payer. I think instead of worrying about blame, instead of trying to play the politics and think through it—and listen, I am not nearly smart enough to play through all the political angles and everything else—it is a lot simpler to stand and do the right thing. One of the easiest ways to do the right thing is to listen to the American people.

You want to know what the Amer- ican people are worried about. Go home and listen to your constituents. Their concerns are: I am trying to get a job and I can’t get a job. I am trying to grow my small business and ObamaCare is driving us out of business. I am afraid of losing my health insurance and ObamaCare is taking away health insurance.

Look, we have read, and I have stack after stack that I am going to keep reading, from individual constituents—constituents in Texas and Virginia and Utah and Alabama and all over the country—about losing their health insurance because of ObamaCare, who are losing their jobs and being forced into part-time work. We need to listen to the people.

I told the men and women who are watching tonight if they were to tweet the hashtag “MakeDCListen,” which has been, over the course of this, trending No. 1, that I would share some of the tweets they sent. So with your indulgence, I would like to do so to help give them a voice.

Many of these folks right now presum- ably cannot walk on to the Senate Floor and give a speech. Maybe in a few years some of them might. Maybe in a few years, it is certainly in this body don’t listen to the American people we may get quite a few of these tweeters who show up as new Senators committed to listening to the American people. But in the meantime—

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one question?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CRUZ. I am happy to yield for a question without yielding the floor.

Mr. SESSIONS. When the Senator thinks about those people who have tweeted and e-mailed and called and have written, most know something about the American system. If you were in Illinois or Alabama or Texas or Utah and you talked about this and said: This law has got real problems and it can’t work the way it is, wouldn’t the Senator think they would trust the Senator to take up this legislation and actually discuss it in a grownup way; that amendments could be offered that could fix it and be voted on up or down?

Doesn’t the Senator think the fact we are in this situation—the Senator called it a steamroller—where the major- ity leader is blocking all amend- ments, all ability to attempt to fix this legislation and make something that would actually work, even though the House has passed repeatedly changing this law and ending this law, that the average American would be shocked to think we are incapable in this Senate of bringing up legislation and having it voted on and amendments?

Mr. CRUZ. I think Senator Sessions is absolutely right. The Senate isn’t trying to fix this bill. The Senate isn’t trying to respond to the needs of the American people. It isn’t trying to re- spond to the jobs that have been lost, to the taxpayers forced into part-time work, to the people who have lost their health insurance. Instead, it is responding to political power.

I will note that any Republican—on Friday or Saturday when we have the cloture vote—who votes to cut off de- bate is voting to give majority leader Harry Reid the ability to force fund- ing for ObamaCare with no changes—changes, amendments, or amend- ments. The Senator from Alabama can’t offer amendments. I can’t offer amendments, and we can’t do any- thing. It is a pure exercise of political power on a straight party-line vote. That will make many Republicans happy because they will get to sym- bolically vote against it, and then we will be certain to lose it if it is a 51-vote threshold.

Part of the reason, I would suggest, and one can understand why the major- ity leader wants to do that. Listen, if you are defending a law such as ObamaCare, that is a train wreck, in the words of the Democrat who wrote the bill, you don’t want to debate the substance of it. When the esteemed member from Illinois—on the floor—and I appreciate his coming—he sure didn’t want to debate why there is a congressional exemption, why Mem- bers of Congress are treated better than average Americans, why Presi- dent Obama granted a special exemp- tion for Members of Con- gress but hard-working Amer- ican families are not.

Look, I understand. If I were the Democratic majority leader and I were defending that position, I wouldn’t want to defend it either. Because I have to tell you there is not a State in the Union where our constituents wouldn’t just about tar and feather us if we stood in front of them and de- fended that, yes, there should be a spe- cial exemption for Members of Con- gress but not for you. And for big busi- ness. President Obama granted a spe- cial exemption for big business, but not for you, not for hard-working Amer- ican families.

Look, what a perfect example of the broken system, of the disconnect be- tween DC and the American people. It is indefensible on the merits, and so this whole process is designed not to debate on the merits. It is designed never to have that debate because, as I observed earlier, the old adage in the court- room—and my friend Senator LEE will recognize this from his days as a litigator, as will the Chair—if you have the law, you have the law, pound the law; if you don’t have either, pound the table.

So if you are defending ObamaCare, if you are defending exemptions for giant corporations and Members of Congress that don’t go to the average American family, you don’t want to talk about the facts and you don’t want to talk about the law, so you want to pound the table. You want to talk about shutting down the government. You want to scare people. You want to threaten corporations and Members of Congress and women in the military, which is gross- ly irresponsible. I think Congress should never ever imperil the salaries
of the men and women who risk their lives to protect us.

This body should immediately take up the Defense authorization bill the House passed so that we can make sure the men and women in the military are always ready in the way they were always ready without that—if there were a partial shutdown—the President has all the authority he needs in existing law to pay the men and women in the military.

But if you don’t want to debate the merits, you have to distract people. So it is a game. If you talk to a professional magician, magicians are good at banter and they are good at smoke and mirrors and distraction. Sometimes when they raise their hand and they have a shiny object over here and they want everyone to look over here, it is because they are pulling a card out of the deck with this hand. There are a lot of professional magicians in this Senate—listen to all of the discussion about shutdown and, for that matter, all of the personal politics—all of the attacks, more than a few of which have occurred within the Republican conference, more than a few of which have been directed at Senator Sanders and a few which have been directed at myself, and more than a few have been directed at the courageous House conservatives who led the fight in the House to get the House of Representatives to do the right thing and defund Obamacare. It is not even the purpose that appears on the face of it. One would think the purpose is as it appears on the face. One would think the purpose for leaking nasty quotes, trying to beat up people, sending congressional staffers to get anonymous quotes—a little bit of profligacy, a sort of mean, wicked sense of humor is because they are trying to pound somebody. It is not that, although that is an added side benefit. It is all about distraction. Make it about the personalities, make it about the people, make it about anything, anything, anything other than Obamacare.

If we were actually talking about Obamacare, if we were listening to the people—listen, if we were listening to the people, the people don’t give a flip about any of the hundred of us. They don’t care about politicians. And for good reason. There are very few people in America who say, when asked what do you think on the topic of July, they want to pal around with a bunch of elected politicians. Most people want to be in their backyard grilling burgers with their kids. God bless them. That is why America is the greatest country on Earth, because we have families and it is not about government. You know, in a totalitarian regime, everyone thinks about government almost all the time. Because when you have a jackboot on the back of your neck, it is hard to think about anything else.

The game in Washington is smoke and mirrors. The game in Washington is distract from anything, anything, anything, except the thing the American people care about—fixing the jobs and the American economy. That is not what is happening.

All right, let me read some tweets.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield one more time for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CRUZ. I am happy to yield for a question. I would note my friend from Alabama seems bound and determined to stop the tweets. God bless him.

Mr. SESSIONS. I am interested in those tweets. I just wanted to thank the Senator for his tweets. I know the tweets have been directed at me, because I think he is alerting all of us to the critical importance of the health care issue.

This is a plan, it seems to me, and the presently written, will not work, to take over health care by the U.S. Government. We can all disagree. I was here when everybody on the Republican side fought this legislation until Christmas Eve, when it was finally passed. Shortly before Scott Brown from Massachusetts could take office and kill it. That is how close it was. I know people disagree about how to deal with it, and I understand and respect their reservations, but I wanted to say the Senator’s leadership has served a valuable purpose tonight, and I am pleased to be able to support his effort. I wish him every success in those efforts, and I hope, as the Senator continues tonight, that he will drive home the critical importance of this issue as we go forward. It is a matter this entire Nation cannot look away from. It is a matter we need to consider fixing because the legislation, as presently written, will not work. We have two choices, it seems to me. We move forward to a single payer, as Senator Sanders said we must do because this legislation won’t work as written. That is the classical American view of insurance and private health care and our own personal physicians.

I thank the Senator from Texas and would be pleased to hear some of those great tweets I know he has.

Mr. CRUZ. I thank the Senator from Alabama, and I thank him for his perseverance, his leadership, and his courage. I will say there have been more than a few legislative fights, and even a few while I have served in this body, on which JEFF SESSIONS and I have been fighting side by side, and I appreciate his friendship and wisdom, and it matters in this body.

Let’s hear from the American people some of the tweets that were sent this afternoon during this discussion:

Already got a second job again because taxes are squeezing me dry. Make D.C. listen.

Congress passes laws that they don’t follow, lives large off our money, and have contempt for those they represent. Make D.C. listen.

2700 pages when it was passed, over 20,000 pages now to implement. Make D.C. listen.

Vote no on cloture is a vote to fund ObamaCare. Defund ObamaCare. Make D.C. listen.
ago, and $450 was that individual’s health insurance premium. Now it is $880 in 2013. That is the impact ObamaCare is having.

Here is a nice one: Thank you for reading tweets so the American people can be heard. Make D.C. listen.

You are welcome. It is a privilege to have a chance to in some small way help provide a voice for the American people.

IRS bureaucrats don’t want ObamaCare, either, but they are happy to force everyone else to do so. Make D.C. listen.

ObamaCare has turned America into a part-time nation. People are losing their homes. They can’t feed their children properly. Make D.C. listen.

I wish to think about that last tweet for a second. ObamaCare has turned America into a part-time nation, and people are losing their homes. They can’t feed their children properly. If any Member of this body was forced to work part-time, was losing his or her home, couldn’t feed his or her children properly, it would be a crisis. Talk about getting our attention—it would be a crisis. If it was a family member, if it was you, if it was your house, if our home, facing that, we would move Heaven and Earth to address it. Yet here it is our boss, the American people who are experiencing that, and most Members of this Senate are doing something else other than being here. I will note that we have Congressman LOUIE GOHMERT, Congressman PAUL BROWN, and Congressman RICHARD HUDSON was here earlier. But where is the Senate?

We don’t feel the pain of the American people like it is, ours, like it is us. It is not surprising because President Obama has exempted Congress from ObamaCare, so we are not feeling the pain. That is the problem.

ObamaCare has turned America into a part-time nation and people are losing their homes. They can’t feed their children properly, Make D.C. listen. Three years and they still can’t get it going. Make D.C. listen.

Make D.C. listen, because D.C. is not listening to the American people. HELP US.

Defund ACA. It is job killing and not affordable and we won’t get care, and our politicians act like it is good for us.

Well, that is true. A lot of politicians do act as though this is really good for you. Mind you, we don’t want to be subject to it, but trust us, it is good for you. Different rules apply to the Washington, DC, ruling class than apply to the American people. That is the problem.

Help revive the economy. Make D.C. listen and defund ObamaCare. Fix ObamaCare. If you want a real health care reform, ObamaCare is a disaster. Make D.C. listen. Let the plan be cancelled due to the ACA ruins the “like it, keep it” narrative. Make D.C. listen.

By the way, that is from an individual who is @demcalal. Makes me wonder if that is a Democrat in California named Al. I don’t know if it is, but it would be interesting if it were.

What is interesting about this is that if you get outside of Washington, it is not just Republicans who understand ObamaCare isn’t working; it is Democrats, Independents, libertarians.

I feel quite confident that James Hoffa, the president of the Teamsters, is not a Republican. I really have no doubts about him. Hoffa, in a public letter has said that ObamaCare is destroying the 40 hour workweek that is the backbone of the American middle class.

Those are just the facts. That is what is happening. If we were listening to the American people, every one of us would be here doing everything we could to turn it around now. We wouldn’t be happy to wait until the end of the week. We would say: Now, let’s stop this job killer.

Defund ObamaCare, because I know what is best for my health care, not some bureaucrat. Make D.C. listen.

Defund ObamaCare. The majority of America is against this intrusion into our private relationship with our doctor. Make D.C. listen.

Make D.C. listen because ObamaCare is killing full-time jobs. Make D.C. listen. Defund ObamaCare because it takes our freedom away. If you love freedom and choice, oppose tyrannical-style government laws, then make D.C. listen to you.

Tired of Senators who won’t listen. Make D.C. listen.

Make D.C. listen. Please stop ObamaCare. It is killing this country. We need the government to listen to the people and do what is best for the country. I support defunding ObamaCare 100 percent. Make D.C. listen.

Make D.C. listen. We don’t want government intrusion into our health care. D.C. isn’t listening. Everyone in America understands that ObamaCare isn’t working. Make D.C. listen.

The health care reform that the President sold America isn’t the health care reform that America is getting. Make D.C. listen.

ObamaCare. AIN’T NOBODY GOT TIME FOR THAT!!! Make D.C. listen.

Way to go listen to our voices calling for individual liberty. Make D.C. listen. We don’t get an exception, so what’s the use?

I agree. I think all of us should get an exception. Every American should get an exception. And there is no world in which Congress should be treated better than hard-working American families.

I don’t want more government. Make D.C. listen.

I wish the Senate would listen to us. Please listen to the people. We don’t want this bill, we want freedom. Make D.C. listen. Make D.C. listen. ObamaCare is turning us into a part-time economy.

Government is designed to go by the will of the people, not the other way around. Make D.C. listen.

We don’t want it, don’t need it, can’t afford it. Please tell them to listen to its citizens. Make D.C. listen.


Make D.C. listen. Analysts, experts, and business people agree that the ACA will hurt our economy.

Americans are fed up with our elected officials not listening. We don’t want ObamaCare. Make D.C. listen.

Let the free market health care more affordable by allowing sales across state lines. Make D.C. listen.

Let me say, by the way, that is a terrific proposal. Once we defund ObamaCare, there will be a lot we will need to do on health insurance. There is a lot we need to do on health care reform to make it more affordable, to make it work, to make our policies personal and portable so they go with you regardless of what job you are in.

One of the best things we can do is allow interstate competition. Right now it is illegal to purchase health insurance across State lines. Why does that matter? Well, the biggest barrier to access for people who don’t have health insurance is the cost. You get government regulators who drive the cost up and up because they mandate this bill and this whisle, and you have to cover everything they want. It is a great thing for politicians because if you mandate that every health insurance policy has to cover this procedure, it lets politicians come to the people and say: I am giving you free what-have-yous. But one of the simplest principles of government is that there ain’t no such thing as a free lunch.

Every time you mandate that a health insurance plan must include whatever benefit it is that politicians want to give away, you increase the cost to the people, up the cost. Every time the cost goes up, there are more and more people who can’t afford it. So you can have a lot of politicians giving away free stuff, and when you do that, it will mean there will be a whole bunch of people who get no coverage at all because they can’t afford it.

If we were to allow purchases across State lines, we would see a true 50-State national marketplace, true competition. There would be real choice.

By the way, the people who may be the biggest losers of all under ObamaCare are the young. It is difficult to design a bill to do more damage to young people. The “lost generation” is what economists dubbing young people, in significant part because of the consequences of ObamaCare. If you are a young healthy person, it may well make sense to purchase catastrophic health insurance—health insurance that if, God forbid, you get hit by a truck tomorrow, if you are diagnosed with some horrible life-threatening disease.

The odds are relatively small that is going to happen to any of us, but if it does, it is very bad, and that is when we want health insurance. If you could purchase insurance across State lines, there would be a 50-State market and you could get low-cost, inexpensive catastrophic health insurance.

If you think about health insurance right now, it doesn’t work like insurance. I wish to compare it to an insurance market that works. Most of us are familiar with car insurance. Most of us who have cars have car insurance. With car insurance, if you need to change the provider, it is very simple. You go to Allstate and say: Change the oil in my car. If you get a flat tire, you typically do not call Allstate and say: Hey, I
have a flat tire, change the tire on my car. God forbid, if you get hit by an 18-wheeler and your car gets totaled, then you call your insurance company and say this catastrophic event happened; that is why I have insurance. A lot of people when it comes to health insurance though, right now the system is treated as just a third-party payer instead of dealing with catastrophic, unlikely events. That is a reform that would make a real difference.

If you cannot access to low-cost health insurance, allowing people to purchase it across State lines after we defund ObamaCare would make a real difference, and if we added to that reforms that expanded health savings accounts so you could save in a tax-advantaged way to meet routine prevention and maintenance, to take care of the equivalent, in the auto context, of changing the tire, that would go even further; and if we changed the tax law right now—most people do not know that auto provided health care is an historical anomaly. It actually arose during World War II. Shortly thereafter, when wage and price controls were in effect, employers had a challenge. They wanted to recruit employees—they could not raise wages. It was against the law. So they began offering health insurance as a way to attract people, to say come work for our company, we will give you health insurance.

Right now the Federal tax laws heavily favor employer health insurance. The problem is, we don’t live in 1950s America now. There was a time when people would get a job in a big company and work 30, 40, 50 years, retire, get a gold watch, and that would be it. We don’t live in that kind of world anymore.

Most people will work for one company, then another company, then another company—relatively unlikely that Americans are going to stay with one company their entire life. They are going to switch jobs, possibly a lot, sometimes voluntarily and sometimes not voluntarily.

When you and I were in the private sector, Mr. President, if we lost our jobs and got fired, you didn’t lose your life insurance. You didn’t lose your car insurance. The only insurance you would lose if you lost your job was your health insurance. That doesn’t make any sense. Of all of them it is the worst one to lose.

The Senator from Illinois asked about preexisting conditions. If we could change the law so health insurance plans were personal and portable, just like your car insurance, regardless of where you happen to work it goes with you, it travels with you, that goes a long way to solving the problem of preexisting conditions, because where preexisting conditions have such a big impact, Senator Cruz pointed out, that is why I have insurance. The reforms I laid out are all about empowering you, the American people, empowering you, the patient, to make a choice, empowering you to make decisions about your health care with your doctor, with your people who are taking care of you anywhere near you. I am going to suggest the difference is those plans come from listening to the people. ObamaCare is the opposite of listening to the people.

Mr. LEE. Will the Senator from Texas yield for a question?

Mr. CRUZ. I am happy to yield to my friend from Utah for a question, and I will return with yet more tweets at a later point.

Mr. LEE. I say to Senator CRUZ I have come with some updates from the outside world, updates based on what I am hearing from my constituents at home. You may be interested in learning, sir, or you may not, that just today in the last 12 hours or so my office has received nearly 1,100 e-mails, 1,093 to be precise. Almost every single one of those is asking us to do whatever we can, do whatever it takes, to defund ObamaCare. People are asking us to fund government, keep government functioning, but to defund ObamaCare.

I also have some news from a local paper in the State of Utah. This is from the Box Elder News Journal in the northern part of my State. In an article written by Mike Nelson, an associated editor with the Box Elder News Journal, we read about Brigham City moving, its payroll, to cut its payroll, in order to avoid certain ObamaCare provisions. I am going to quote just from part of it here. It says:

Changes are coming for paid on-call employees at Brigham City Emergency Services Department. We were contacted by the department and the city to avoid employee eligibility for health care under the Affordable Care Act. ‘Back in February it became apparent the ACA—

Or for those of you who see the newspapers, ObamaCare—

was going to dramatically impact the way we manage our fire and ambulance crews,’ said emergency services director Jim Buchanam, while addressing the issue at an August 1 city council meeting.

This is one of many examples of not just businesses but also local governments that are having to make cuts in their payroll in order to adjust for this law. This is having a real impact on real people.

It is having an impact also on students. I received a message from a student in Utah. Sarah, Sarah, today, a college student, writes:

I am a student facing a shrinking job market with fewer options. Now it seems ObamaCare is going to force me as a healthy young person to keep the President’s health plan functioning. How is that fair?
the other Republican leaders in the House of Representatives and by the
rank-and-file Members of the House who voted for this legislation. When
they voted for this legislation to keep government funded while defunding
ObamaCare they stood with the Ameri-
can people who asked them for relief
from this bill.
American people had been telling
them: Look, we need help. They have
been asking: How many of us will have
to see our hours cut? How many of us
will have to experience wage cuts? How
many of us will have to lose access to
the health care we have enjoyed for
many years before Congress acts?
The House of Representatives did act.
The body within our government, the
branch within Congress that is most
responsive to the American people,
acted to protect the American people
from this harmful law while simulta-
neously keeping the Federal Govern-
ment operating.
Now what has happened and that
bill is moving over to the Senate, the
ball is in our court, we have a couple
of possible responses to that. The first
would be we could take it up and we
could vote on it as is. We could vote on
it just as it was passed by the House.
We could vote on it, up or down, as is
without any amendment. That would
be fine. I would be fine with that. If
that is what we were doing, I would
be voting yes on the cloture vote. Of
course, I would, I suspect my friend, the
junior Senator from Texas, would as
well.
There is another option. We could
say rather than vote on it as is, let's
make adjustments to it. Let's invite
amendments. Let's have an open
amendment process whereby Senators,
whether Democrats or Republicans or
the couple of Independents we have,
could submit amendments as they
deem fit, have those amendments not
just proposed but debated, discussed,
and ultimately voted upon. That would
be an acceptable alternative.
People around here often call this
the Senate, the world's greatest delib-
erative body. They call it that because
this is a place where, in theory, we are
supposed to have access to an open
amendment process; theoretically un-
limited debate. Is it time consuming?
Yes. Is it cumbersome? Absolutely. Can
it be frustrating? Without question.
But it is one of the things that distin-
guishes this body. It is one of the
things that makes this the Senate.
So if we were to have an open amend-
ment process, it would take a lot of
time and it might even require another
all-night session just like we had a few
months ago in connection with the
budget resolution, but it would be
worth it. It would be entirely accept-
able, and I would be voting yes on clo-
ture on the bill if that is what we were
faced with. But what we are faced with,
what we are going to have to do is what
we are told is being prepared to accept
is neither of those options; not
being given the opportunity to vote yes
or no, up or down on the resolution
passed by the House of Representatives
nor would we be given the opportunity
to have an open amendment process,
one that allows individual Senators to
propose amendments and have those
amendment considered, voted on in
this body.
What we are being told instead is
that what we will have is a single
amendment brought forward by the
Senate majority leader, one amend-
ment that, under cloture, and
that amendment, by the way, would
strip out the defunding language, it
would gut the House-passed continuing
resolution of a provision that many
would consider the "without which"
part of the House-passed bill, meaning
the part without which the
House of Representatives could not and
would not have gotten the necessary
218 votes to pass a continuing resolu-
tion. That is a problem. That is a prob-
lem indeed because that suggests that
when we vote yes on cloture, that
amendment, where Senator Reid is contemplates allowing neither an open amendment
process nor an up-or-down vote on the
House-passed resolution in as-is condi-
tion—either of those circumstances,
we would not have gotten the votes
ting that. We are getting stuck with
something else. He wants to gut the
House-passed continuing resolution
with the defunding language without
any open amendment process and with-
course without the opportunity for an up-or-down vote.
So in that circumstance, I don't un-
derstand why it would be the case that
Republicans would feel that voting yes
would be supporting the House of Rep-
resentatives and voting no would be
voting against the House of Represent-
atives. In fact, it seems to me, I say to
Senator Cruz, that would be quite the
opposite of that. It seems to me that if,
in fact, one wanted to stand behind the
House of Representatives and at the
same time behind their willingness to defend the
American people and protect them
from this harmful law, at the end of
the day that would entail that anyone
who wanted to stand with the House of
Representatives on that point would
effectively need to vote no if, in fact,
Senator Reid does what we expect him
to do later this week.
Would the Senator agree that is what
one could expect in that circumstance?
And I do agree that Majority Leader
Reid is likely to have 53 Democrats going along with him, and if
Senator Reid has 53 Democrats going
along with him, doesn't that rather un-
dercut the argument that in order to
support the House-passed bill one must
vote yes on the cloture vote on cloture
on the bill?
Mr. CRUZ. I thank Senator Lee for
his very good question. I think the an-
swer is absolutely yes. If the objective
of any Senate Republican is to support
the House Republicans, the bill they
passed to defund ObamaCare, then one
obviously would not vote to allow Ma-
jority Leader Harry Reid to strip out
all of the operative language and to
fund ObamaCare with a 51-vote pure
partisan Democratic majority. That is
not complicated. To be honest, it is
something every Senator in this body
understands. All the Democrats under-
stand it. It is why Harry Reid is vot-
ing yes on this bill. Presumably,
every Democrat will vote yes on cloture. Why? It is the reason some of
our colleagues have used as well: A
"yes" vote on cloture says that they
support the House of Representatives'
bill to defund ObamaCare. I
suppose that means, then, that
Harry Reid suddenly supports
defunding ObamaCare and that every
Democrat supports defunding
ObamaCare. I say to my friend Senator
Lee that I would be very happy if that
were the case. If that interpretation
were right and suddenly Harry Reid
and every Democrat supported
defunding ObamaCare, that would be
terrific. We know for a fact it is not the
case. We know for a fact it is not the
case because they publicly said it.
We know for a fact it is not the case
because just yesterday I asked for
unanimous consent to simply pass the
House bill. If every Democrat and
Harry Reid were defunding ObamaCare, he wouldn't have objected.
Everyone understands that the clo-
ture vote on Friday or Saturday will be
a vote to allow Harry Reid to fully
fund ObamaCare using only a 51-vote
majority that allows him on a
straight partisan line. There is no con-
fusion on that. Every Democrat under-
stands that, and every Republican un-
derstands that.
However, there is some confusion,
but not in this body, and it is so Sen-
ators believe with the American people
because Senators think, well, the poli-
tics and procedural mumbo-jumbo is
confusing enough that I can vote yes,
give Harry Reid the ability to fund
ObamaCare, and at the same time run
paid advertisements—as more than
a few of our colleagues may well be
doing right now—that say: I want to
defund ObamaCare. They can't do both.
They can't have Harry Reid the abil-
ity to fund ObamaCare and claim they
want to defund it. Pick a side. Pick a
position and stand by your beliefs.
I will give an analogy. The House of
Representatives passed a bill that cut
taxes, and then it came over to the
Senate and the Majority Leader, Harry
Reid, announced that he wanted to file for
cloture on that bill, and then after that
happened, he would file an amendment
to erase all the tax cuts and to jack up
taxes by $1 trillion. Let's suppose he
announced this publicly and told every-
one: This is what I plan to do—and by
the way, it is going to be the only
amendment. I will totally gut the
House bill and turn a tax cut into a tax
increase. I am absolutely certain if
that were the case all 46 Republicans
would vote against cloture. We get the
game.
Voting to cut off debate is voting
to allow the majority leader to gut the
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House bill. So any Senator who votes for cloture is saying: I want the majority leader to be able to gut the House bill. But it is even better than that. What was it that P.T. Barnum said? You can fool some of the people all the time, and all the people some of the time, but you can't fool all of the people all of the time. There are a lot of Members of this body who think: Some people all of the time. There are a lot of them, but you can't fool all of the people some of the time, and all the people some of the time, and all the people all of the time. There are a lot of Members of this body who think: Some of the people all of the time will be just good enough for me. If I can vote to give HARRY REID the ability to fund Obamacare, and the American beauty, when we get to a 51-vote threshold on ObamaCare, I can vote against funding ObamaCare, I can go home and say: Hey, I voted twice the right way. Of course, I did it in a way that guaranteed 100 percent that we are going to lose. It guaranteed that ObamaCare would be funded.

Now, for that strategy to work, it depends upon voters being really gullible and confused. I would say that tweets earlier. Earlier we talked about how we are not living in the 1950s. In many respects we are, but not in the 1950s. One of those respects is we no longer have three big news networks that control all the news and limit what we can find about what is going on. The mainstream media won't cover in an effort to provide fair and balanced news. We have talk radio. God bless talk radio. It is an avenue to reach out to millions of Americans, and it is able to go right around the mainstream media gatekeepers. We have the Internet. We have social media. We have Facebook and Twitter. We can disseminate information directly.

In the 1950s one could do some procedural maneuvers. One could hide an obfuscation, and people wouldn't know. One of the fascinating things—and I suspect the Presiding Officer has done this as well as an avid student of history—is listening to the old L.B.J. tapes. L.B.J. would be talking to one group on tape and say: I am totally with you. And then he would be on tape talking to the other side saying: I am totally with you. He would tell different groups things that were 180 degrees opposite of each other. He would say one thing to one group and another thing to another group. They were so different, they would never get a chance to reconcile.

I would suggest that in 2013 that is a lot harder to do. In 2013, if they tell one group they are totally with them, you'd better believe the other group will find out about them.

In 2013, if a Member votes—I hope they don't, but some Republicans might—I give HARRY REID the power to fund ObamaCare. I vote for a straight partisan 51-vote threshold, then that Member is voting to fund ObamaCare and their constituents are going to know about it. It is not anything any of us are going to do because our constituents are now engaged and following this debate directly. So the ad that says “I am for defunding ObamaCare” while at the same time fighting to keep funding ObamaCare doesn't exist in the Internet age. It doesn't work.

What is the old line? I try not to lie. I try to tell the truth because it is so hard to keep track of the lies. Instead of telling people multiple positions, I just stand and fight for what you believe in.

Earlier we were talking about BERNIE SANDERS. I respect the heck out of BERNIE SANDERS. Actually—and this is a comment that often surprises our friends in the media and even some Democrats—I respect President Obama. I respect the man a great deal because I think he is deeply committed to his principles. I think he has taken political risks for his principles. I think he is very much a true believer. Everything I have seen about his entire course of life—I think he believes genuinely, earnestly, and with all of his heart in government solutions, government control of the economy. The President embraces that policy. I think he is deeply committed to his policies. I think he has taken political risks for his principles, I think he has been a true believer. And then he would be a true believer. America. At the same time, I believe the ideas the President believes in, but I believe the policies he has advanced are profoundly harmful—not a little bit wrong but profoundly harmful to this country.

You know what? That is a debate we can have. That is a policy debate I welcome. Has it been good or bad for Americans to implement ObamaCare? Has it been good or bad for Americans to see jobs drying up? Has it been good or bad for Americans to see small businesses not grow anymore? Has it been good or bad for Americans to see health insurance premiums skyrocketing? Has it been good or bad for Americans to see more and more people losing their health insurance? That is a debate I am happy to have on the substance. That is an honest debate. The President embraces that policy.

I will confess that what produces more of the cynicism and skepticism toward Washington are the politicians who don't have the honest debates and don't tell the American people that that fond of ObamaCare, but it doesn't matter enough to me to risk anything on it. I care more about staying in office than I do, actually, about fighting a fight. So I want to take some symbolic votes, and I don't want to risk any chance of anyone blaming me for the downside.

I get why voters are frustrated with that. I get why voters are frustrated with politicians saying one thing and doing another. It shouldn't be complicated. Do what you say. It shouldn't be complicated. Stand for your principles. If you don't believe ObamaCare should be funded and that Obamacare is hurting Americans, then stand and say: Let's defund ObamaCare.

I have made it very clear that we could end this debate right now if the majority leader would come down and say—look, the best way to end this debate would be if we could agree to pass the House continuing resolution to fund all of government except for ObamaCare. I recognize that is not likely to happen anytime soon, but it would be the best way, and it would be the way that is most responsive to the American people. But the Presiding Officer's way to end this debate—and, by the way, to expedite this whole process—is to simply have the majority leader agree to have open amendments and have those amendments subject to a 60-vote threshold.

The Presiding Officer and I have both been here the same number of months—9 months. During the time we have been here, we have seen vote after vote after vote with a 60-vote threshold. It is very frustrating.

The Presiding Officer will remember the guns debate we had. Guns are an emotional and passionate issue. It is an issue people on both sides care a lot about. I get that. The Presiding Officer and I had a member that stood on the floor of this Senate, every single amendment was subject to a 60-vote threshold.

In the course of that debate, I introduced, along with SENATOR HUCK GRASSLEY, the Grassley-Cruz bill. It was a law enforcement alternative. Instead of restricting the Second Amendment rights of law-abiding citizens, it was targeting violent criminals. It was going after felons and fugitives who tried to illegally buy guns. It was going after those who commit violent crimes with guns. It was going after States that don’t report mental health records to the background check system.

We just saw a horrific shooting in Washington, DC. All of us are mourning for the victims and the families there. The individual, it appears, had significant mental health issues. The Grassley-Cruz bill would have mandated significant incentives and penalties for States to get them to report mental health records, because our background mental health system doesn’t work if we don’t have the mental health records in them. As of a date relatively recently—I don’t recall the date—but the top of my head but relatively recently this year—I believe there were 18 States that reported 100 or fewer records.

The Presiding Officer will recall what happened with that bill, and every amendment. We got a majority. A majority of Senators voted for the Grassley-Cruz bill. Indeed, nine Democrats voted for the Grassley-Cruz bill. It was the most bipartisan of any of the comprehensive gun legislation that was considered by this body. There was no Democrat that voted for the Grassley-Cruz bill that was close to that level of bipartisan support across the aisle. Yet the Grassley-Cruz bill did not pass into law. It
The Republican side in the conference
ican people. That has a lot of people on
ing to shut the government down in
overnment shutdown. I don't think
House holds their ground, it is entirely
of happening, because anytime we take
doing anything that has a real chance
licans who are nervous about actually
give speeches, humdingers sometimes.
but there are more than a few Repub-
 talking points without mention
the job loss and the health insurance
 premiums going up and people losing
their health insurance. I think most
Democratic Senators are nervous about
it but not yet ready to abandon ship.
On the Republican side, there is not a
Republican there who doesn't enjoy giv-
ing speeches about ObamaCare. We can
give speeches, humdingers sometimes.

Most Democrats, in my view, are pri-
vately getting more and more nervous
about the train wreck that this is. They
are seeing—we can't go home and talk
to our constituents without mentioning
theark, it is entirely possible that majority leader HARRY
REID and President Obama will force a
government shutdown. I don't think
they should. I think it will be a mis-
take. But they have said they are will-
ing to shut the government down in order
to force ObamaCare on the Amer-
ican people. That has a lot of people on
the Republican side in the conference
nervous because they think. Well, if
President Obama and HARRY REID shut
the government down, they will blame
it on Republicans and the media will
all repeat that attack. The mainstream
media, every one of them, will repeat
word for word the talking points. It
will get to the point that the stories we
read in the major newspapers will read
as if they were written by the White
House Press Office.

But the people have known the way of
the world for a long time. So there are Rep-
ublicans nervous about. Well, even if
the President and HARRY REID force a
shutdown, Republicans will get blamed
and we don't want the political blame
so we don't want to fight this fight. In
fact, a lot of Republicans have been
seen to the press and said, We can't win,
we can't win. Let's just cut our losses
are asking, Why haven't Democrats
come over to join us? Listen, the Pre-
siding Officer and I both know no Dem-
ocrat is going to come join us as long
as half the Republican conference is
split and throwing rocks at us. There
is no incentive for anyone to do that now.
The only hope of bringing Democrats to
support the continuing resolution is to
say to Republicans. If we get all 46 Republic-
s who stand together opposing cloture and
to say, No, we are not going to let
HARRY REID shut down all amend-
ments; we are not going to let HARRY
REID fund ObamaCare on a straight
party-line vote; and then, if those Demo-
crats elected in red States begin hearing from their constituents
in incredible numbers—listen, I will
tell my colleagues, the people of Ar-
kanas, the people of Louisiana, the
people of North Carolina, they under-
stand ObamaCare is a train wreck.
They would like their Senators to lis-
ten to them. The Presiding Officer and
I both know, when we start to hear
from 5,000, 10,000, 20,000 30,000 of our
constituents, it changes our calculus.
If there is one thing the men and
women of this body like, it is to get re-
elected. The only way this fight is
going to be won is if the American peo-
ple speak so loudly that the politicians
in this body have no choice but to lis-
ten to the people.

Let me give an example, an example
the Presiding Officer and I spoke about
at the time. About a month ago, we all
reminded the American public that
Obama publicly announced his intention to launch
unilateral military attack on the na-
tion of Syria. When that happened, bi-
partisan leaders in both the House and
the Senate fairly quickly came out in
support of that plan. Just about every
commentator—just about every talk-
ling head in Washington—said there was
no chance of stopping it. It was going
to happen. It was a done deal. It was
going to happen. In fact, they were the
same voices who are saying now, with regard to ObamaCare. It can
't be done, accept it, accept it, it
can't be done, can't be done. All of
those exact voices said about Syria: He
is going to attack, there is nothing we
can do, it will be done.

The Presiding Officer and I both
spoke out loudly, saying the President
should bring the issue to Congress, and
I commend the President for listening
to bipartisan calls. That was not easy.
I have no doubt there was significant
pressure on those who are for Obama-
Care, to say, I think this isn't a good
idea. But I am glad the President asked us
to call off that vote, because I don't think
it is good for this country, for Congress
to vote against the Commander in
Chief on issues of national security and
defending this Nation, so I am glad we
were not going to do that.

I want to point out, for everyone who
says defunding ObamaCare is impos-
sible, they are the same voices who
said stopping the attack on Syria was
impossible—the exact same voices,
graybeards—all of the media.

The only thing that is going to
change the dynamic in this body, the
only thing that is going to unite 41 Re-
publicans against cloture, against
ObamaCare, and to defund ObamaCare,
is if the voice of the people becomes
so loud it can't be ignored. The only thing
that is going to start moving red State
Democrats is if the voice of the people
in their States becomes so loud they
cannot be ignored. Ultimately, that is
how we win this fight. It comes down
to the people.

I would also like to have a bit of a
discussion on an issue that I would
note the Presiding Officer and Senator
Lamar near both that vote. But I would
like to have a bit of a discussion on an issue that I would
note the Presiding Officer and Senator
Lamar near both that vote. But I would
like to have a bit of a discussion on an issue that I would
note the Presiding Officer and Senator
Lamar near both that vote. But I would

term for that argument: It is poppycock. It is complete and utter nonsense. That is not the way our constitutional system works.

It is true that Democrats currently have a majority in the Senate and that a Democrat sits in the White House. That is true. But the Constitution gives different branches different responsibilities and in their respective spheres each branch has exceptional power. So when it comes to ordering our military troops into battle, to selecting targets, to making direct decisions of military conflict, the President of the United States is Commander in Chief, and it does not matter if the President is a Democrat or whether 535 Members of Congress are Republicans. When it comes to being Commander in Chief, when it comes to ordering our troops into battle, to making decisions in the midst of conducting war, the Constitution gives the President preeminent authority on that score alone.

When it comes to adjudicating the constitutionality of law—one could make arguments about whether this is right—but as a practical matter, the Constitution and modern acceptance give the Supreme Court preeminence in adjudicating whether a law comport with the Constitution. I would note that is true even if five Justices of the Court are appointed by a different political party, the party that controls both houses of Congress and the Presidency. We could have five Justices appointed by a Democratic President and 535 Republican Members of Congress and a Republican President. Yet on the questions of adjudicating the constitutionality of the law, the Supreme Court would still have preeminence and very significant authority.

When it comes to appropriations, when it comes to the power of the purse, when it comes to spending, article I of the Constitution gives Congress preeminence and, in particular, the House of Representatives. So I will be perfectly honest. If I were to pick one thing for Republicans to have control over, particularly when it comes to funding or defunding something, it would be the House of Representatives. Every pundit who goes on television and says, Well, we just control one-half of one-third of the government—what complete and utter nonsense. Not a single thing that is done in my sphere, the House of Representatives. It is a necessary but-for. And on questions of spending, the House of Representatives has preeminence. So this notion that it can’t be done—and a related point. There are some on the Democratic side of the aisle who make the argument this is the settled law of the land. Accept it already. You guys are bit- terners. We passed it into law. We won a Presidential election again. Game over. You lose.

I understand the political virtue of making that argument. It is always good to convince those who disagree with you to give up their beliefs. Sometimes those on this side of the aisle oblige by doing so. But it is not an argument that has any basis in the Constitution. Is ObamaCare currently the law of the land? Of course. It was passed into law, it is in the statute. It is on the books. No-one on this side of the aisle has argued it is not. We are arguing it should not be. That is a very different thing than saying it is not.

Congress has the power of the purse. Congress has the power—let me finish—there is a basis for arguing to yield for a question. Congress has the power to appropriate. There is no obligation for Congress to appropriate, to fund a law that is not working, that evidence and experience—that what the American people are experiencing has demonstrated it is not working.

So the House of Representatives in voting to defund ObamaCare, while funding the rest of government, is fulfilling its constitutional function. If this body took up that same gunfight, kept government funded, never shut down government, funded every aspect of government except ObamaCare because it is not working, it is hurting the American people, we would be fulfilling our constitutional function as well.

(Mr. MURPHY assumed the Chair.)

I would note the Senator from Virginia rose for a question. I am happy to yield for a question without yielding the floor.

Mr. Kaine. I thank the Senator. I ask the Senator to yield for a series of questions around two issues—first, comments the Senator made earlier about helpful reforms that could be made to the health care system and, second, the Senator’s comments about the need for Members of this body to listen to their constituents. Being in the chair and hearing the Senator, I could not resist but to follow Congress for—kept government funded, never shut down government, funded every aspect of government except ObamaCare because it is not working, it is hurting the American people, we would be fulfilling our constitutional function as well.
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Mr. Kaine. The individual mandate, the individual mandate. Because, to use the fire example again, it would be the equivalent of, if you have fire insurance, have a fire policy to anyone regardless of whether their house is already burned down, it would be the equivalent of saying we are requiring everyone who has a house to buy a policy. Because that is the only way you prevent the insurance market from being bankrupt.

So the individual mandate, the reason ObamaCare includes the individual mandate. Because, to use the fire example again, it would be the equivalent of saying we are requiring everyone who has a house to buy a policy.

But on preexisting conditions, I will point out, No. 1, if you have an issue—and there have been issues with insurance companies acting in bad faith, with insurance companies dropping someone when they get sick, and I think there the legal system should work to prevent that. If you have purchased insurance, if you have paid your premiums, insurance company should not be dropping you when you become sick. I think there is a vital role for State insurance regulators to be involved there and for our contract and tort system—the legal system—to be involved.

I think if we move toward changing the Federal tax laws to make health insurance policies portable, personal, it could go a long way to solving the problem of preexisting conditions. I am not maintaining it will solve it in every instance 100 percent of the time. It is very difficult to work around preexisting conditions. I think one way we can address this is by changing Federal rules that will address 100 percent of the inequitable circumstances one could come up with, and if we tried to
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even remotely threaten the salary of the men and women of our military. I am confident the Senator and I agree, under no circumstances should anyone who is risking his or her life to defend the rest of us find their compensation, their salary threatened.

In my view, existing laws and even requires the President to fund the military regardless of what happens on the continuing resolution, regardless of if we had a partial temporary shutdown.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committee of choice.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–3109. A communication from the Acting Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled, “Audit of the Department of Employment Services Workforce Development Monitoring and Quality Assurance Procedures”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–3110. A communication from the Associate Attorney General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Deputy Director, Office of the General Counsel, General Law, Ethics, and Records Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Administration’s Fiscal Year 2013 Commercial Activities Inventory; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.


EC–3112. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Importation of Mangoes from Australia into the Continental United States” ((RIN0579–AD50) (Docket No. APHIS–2011–0045)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 1, 2013; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–3113. A communication from the Inspector General, General Services Administration, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Deputy Secretary, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 20, 2013; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–3114. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel, General Law, Ethics, and Regulation, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Deputy Secretary, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 23, 2013; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3115. A communication from the Chairmen of the Department of Labor, the National Archives and Records Administration, the General Accounting Office, the Government Accountability Office, the Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction’s Commercial and Inherently Governmental Activities Inventory, and Inherently Governmental Inventory, to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–3116. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “Hydrogen and Fuel Cells: Program Plans”; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–3117. A communication from the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report relative to the implementation of the Formaldehyde Standards for Composite Wood Products Act; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–3118. A communication from the Program Manager, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of a rule entitled “Medicare Program; Obtaining Final Medicare Summary of Benefits and Coverage Reports via Web Portal” (RIN0938–AR89) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 19, 2013; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–3119. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13–121); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–3120. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13–3561); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–3121. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (RATS–13–3517); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–3122. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13–127); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–3123. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13–125); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–3124. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13–089); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–3125. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13–079); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–3126. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 13–122); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.