

If the Cabinet Secretaries want more flexibility with their budgets, I urge them to encourage the President to lead and reform the main problem and to address the main drivers of our spending, which is the runaway mandatory spending that is eating everybody's lunch. Whether you are for paving more roads, fixing more bridges, funding more medical research or whether you want more money to go into education or any other function of government, if you can't address the big donkey or elephant in the room, which is the mandatory runaway spending, there is not going to be enough funds for any other priorities. We have all known that year after year after year.

Without leadership from the top this cannot happen. It has been tried many times, sometimes with bipartisan efforts, all shot down because we don't have leadership from the White House and from the President of the United States. He is the chief CEO of this country and he needs to manage resources in a more effective way.

Only when we do that will we be able to avoid these constant budget showdowns and short-term stopgap measures which don't solve the problem.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Morning business is closed.

AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEES

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 64, which the clerk will report by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 64) authorizing expenditures by committees of the Senate for the period March 1, 2013, through September 30, 2013.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, first, I wish to thank Senator PAUL, who is going to be offering his amendment in a few minutes, for allowing me to go first. I would like to spend a few minutes speaking in opposition to the Paul amendment.

I wish to talk about the Senate National Security Working Group, which will be the subject of the Paul amendment. This group, along with its predecessor organization, the Senate Arms Control Observer Group, has served a useful role in helping the Senate to fulfill its unique constitutional duty to consider treaties and to provide its advice and consent to their ratification.

The Senate National Security Working Group is a key component of the Senate's ability to provide advice on treaties before those treaties are finalized because the working group begins meeting with the administration early in the process of negotiation. This was the case for the Senate consideration of the New START treaty a few years ago. The National Security Working Group convened a series of briefings and meetings with the administration starting at the very beginning of the negotiation process, and through the group the Senate has many opportunities to learn of the progress and details of negotiations and to provide our advice and views to the administration throughout the process.

Let me first assure my colleagues that throughout the entire New START negotiation process, the members of the National Security Working Group asked a great number of questions, received answers at a number of meetings, stayed abreast of the negotiation details, and provided advice to the administration. It is a vital process that not only allows Senators to engage the administration early in the negotiation process, but it also gives the administration an opportunity to respond to Senators' concerns and questions and to guide the process in such a manner as to avoid problems during Senate consideration of the treaty ratification process. That was, in fact, the principal original purpose of the Arms Control Observer Group, which ensured early Senate engagement during the negotiation process. This process helps to ensure that there is a core of Senators who are informed on treaty matters before the Senate takes up ratification, and through those Senators the entire Senate can have a role.

I also want to mention briefly to my colleagues that the National Security Working Group is perhaps unique among Senate institutions in that it is, by design, purely bipartisan. It is actually composed of an equal number of Senators from each side of the aisle. Its decisions and actions are not controlled by the majority party; they are arrived at entirely through bipartisan agreement—something we could use more of around here. The bipartisan nature of the group, which is central to its function and its crucial role in helping the Senate fulfill its constitutional treaty role, is something we should support and continue.

We expect there are going to be some additional preliminary negotiations and discussions about those negotiations this year. It is very important that this National Security Working Group continues to have the ability to pave the way for negotiations that can be fruitful.

As I yield the floor, I again thank Senator PAUL for his courtesy in allowing me to go first.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, as some of you may have heard, we are a bit short

of money. We are borrowing \$50,000 every second. We borrow over \$4 billion every day. In a year's time we borrow over \$1 trillion. There are ramifications to that. Some economists now say that the burden of our debt is costing us 1 million jobs a year. What I am asking is, in the midst of this sequester when people say we have no money to cut, to take this small item.

Why would I want to cut this small group? There are a couple of reasons. It is called the National Security Working Group—about \$2.8 million, which is not much money in terms of Washington. But why would I want to cut it?

The first reason would be that there are no records of them meeting. We heard about the START treaty. It was in 2009 when they were last meeting. There are no public records that this group, which spends \$700,000 a year, has met in the last 3 years. There are no public records of who works for the committee. There are no public records of their salaries. Every one of my staff's name and salary is printed in the public record—not for this group.

Now, they say we need this group to negotiate treaties. Well, we have a group; it is called the Foreign Relations Committee. I am on the Foreign Relations Committee, and that is where we discuss treaties—or at least we are supposed to. The Foreign Relations Committee has dozens of employees, and millions of dollars are spent on our committee. It goes through the regular process. Our staff's salaries are approved, the names are in the public record, and if you object, you know where to look for the information. To fund a group that has no records and no records of them meeting and doesn't tell you where they are paying the salaries I don't think makes any sense.

Our job is to look at the money as if it were ours, as if it were yours, and pay attention to detail.

Will this balance the budget? No. Is it a place we should start? Yes. Absolutely. What I would call for is looking and saving where we can. In my office, I have a \$3.5 million budget. I saved \$600,000 last year, and I turned it back in to the Treasury. That doesn't balance the budget, but we have to start somewhere. This is another \$700,000. If I win this one vote, I could save \$700,000—or at least save us from borrowing another \$700,000. If all of your elected officials were up here doing the same, we would be much closer to a resolution. I turned in \$600,000 to the Treasury—18 percent of my budget—and I didn't lay off anybody because we are careful about the way we spend. We spend as if it were our own money. If all of our public officials were doing that, imagine what we could do.

I have another bill that will never see the light of day up here because they don't want to fix anything. This bill would give bonuses to civil servants—Federal employees—who find savings. Right now we do the opposite. If your budget is \$12 million and you work somewhere in the bureaucracy of government, you want to spend it at the

end of the year so you can get it next year.

I would change that incentive. I would give that civil servant a significant bonus if they will keep money at the end of the year and turn it back in to the Treasury. Can you imagine the savings from top to bottom throughout government if we did that? But if we were to do that, to ask civil servants to do that and look for these savings—and right now, with the sequester, people throughout government are looking for savings—why shouldn't we start with the Senate?

Why would we continue to fund a group where the work they supposedly do is also done officially by another group which has many employees, a large staff, and it is the constitutional mandate of the Foreign Relations Committee to discuss treaties.

So while this is a small bit of money, it is symbolic of what needs to go on in this country in order to rectify a problem that is truly bankrupting the American people.

AMENDMENT NO. 25

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to call up amendment No. 25.

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

The clerk will report the amendment.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. PAUL] proposes an amendment numbered 25.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be waived.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To strike supplemental staff funding available only to a limited number of Senators in a time of sequestration)

On page 31, line 22, strike "IN GENERAL.—The Senate National" and insert the following: "RECONSTITUTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Senate National

On page 32, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following:

(B) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as extending or providing funding authority to the Working Group.

On page 35, strike line 2 and all that follows through page 36, line 3, and insert the following:

(1) DESIGNATION OF PROFESSIONAL STAFF.—

On page 36, strike line 14 and all that follows through page 37, line 2.

On page 37, line 3, strike "(C)" and insert "(B)".

On page 37, line 8, strike "(D)" and insert "(C)".

On page 37, line 10, strike "(4)" and insert "(3)".

On page 37, strike lines 13 through 22 and insert the following:

(2) LEADERSHIP STAFF.—The majority leader of the Senate and the minority leader of the Senate may each designate 2 staff members who shall be responsible to the respective leader.

On page 37, line 23, strike "(4)" and insert "(3)".

On page 39, strike line 3 and all that follows through page 40, line 2.

On page 40, line 3, strike "(d)" and insert "(c)".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 30

minutes of debate equally divided and controlled in the usual form.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays when appropriate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

At the moment, there is not a sufficient second.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HEITKAMP). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the quorum be rescinded.

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

Mr. REID. Madam President, we yield back the remainder of all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky, Mr. PAUL.

The yeas and nays have been requested.

Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUGENBERG), and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 53, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 29 Leg.]

YEAS—44

Alexander	Donnelly	Moran
Ayotte	Enzi	Murkowski
Barrasso	Fischer	Paul
Baucus	Flake	Portman
Bennet	Grassley	Pryor
Boozman	Hagan	Risch
Boxer	Heller	Scott
Burr	Inhofe	Sessions
Coats	Johanns	Shaheen
Coburn	Johnson (WI)	Shelby
Collins	Landrieu	Thune
Coons	Lee	Toomey
Corker	McCain	Udall (NM)
Crapo	McCaskill	Vitter
Cruz	Merkley	

NAYS—53

Baldwin	Hatch	Murray
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Nelson
Blunt	Heitkamp	Reed
Brown	Hirono	Reid
Cantwell	Hoeven	Roberts
Cardin	Isakson	Rockefeller
Carper	Johnson (SD)	Rubio
Casey	Kaine	Sanders
Chambliss	King	Schatz
Cochran	Kirk	Schumer
Cornyn	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Cowan	Leahy	Tester
Durbin	Levin	Warner
Feinstein	Manchin	Warren
Franken	McConnell	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Menendez	Wicker
Graham	Mikulski	Wyden
Harkin	Murphy	

NOT VOTING—3

Begich	Lautenberg	Udall (CO)
--------	------------	------------

The amendment (No. 25) was rejected.

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

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 64) was agreed to.

(The resolution is printed in the RECORD of Thursday, February 28, 2013, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon the Senate, at 12:52 p.m. recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. BALDWIN).

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF CAITLIN JOAN HALLIGAN TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to resume consideration of Executive Calendar No. 13, the nomination of Caitlin Halligan.

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

The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Caitlin Joan Halligan, of New York, to be United States Circuit Judge for the District of Columbia Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, tomorrow the Senate will have an opportunity to correct itself and complete action on the nomination of Caitlin Halligan to the DC Circuit. She was first nominated to a vacancy on the court in September 2010, almost 30 months ago. No one who knows her, no one who is familiar with her outstanding legal career can be anything but impressed by her experience, her intelligence, and her integrity. Hers is a legal career which rivals that of the DC Circuit judge she was nominated to succeed.

I might mention that the judge she was nominated to succeed was John Roberts, who served on the DC Circuit. He is now Chief Justice of the United States. I voted for the confirmation of John Roberts to the DC Circuit. I voted for the confirmation of John Roberts to the Supreme Court. He and I do not share the same judicial philosophy or