

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

The result was announced—yeas 97, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 127 Ex.]

YEAS—97

Alexander	Gillibrand	Murphy
Ayotte	Graham	Murray
Baldwin	Grassley	Nelson
Barrasso	Hagan	Paul
Baucus	Harkin	Portman
Begich	Hatch	Pryor
Bennet	Heinrich	Reed
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Reid
Boozman	Heller	Risch
Boxer	Hirono	Roberts
Brown	Hoeven	Rockefeller
Burr	Inhofe	Rubio
Cantwell	Isakson	Sanders
Cardin	Johanns	Schatz
Carper	Johnson (SD)	Schumer
Casey	Johnson (WI)	Scott
Chambliss	Kaine	Sessions
Coats	King	Shaheen
Cochran	Kirk	Shelby
Collins	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Coons	Landrieu	Tester
Corker	Lautenberg	Thune
Cornyn	Leahy	Toomey
Cowan	Lee	Udall (CO)
Crapo	Levin	Udall (NM)
Cruz	Manchin	Vitter
Donnelly	McCain	Warner
Durbin	McCaskill	Warren
Enzi	McConnell	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Menendez	Wicker
Fischer	Merkley	Wyden
Flake	Mikulski	
Franken	Murkowski	

NOT VOTING—3

Blunt	Coburn	Moran
-------	--------	-------

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislative session.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business until 5 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

#### UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST— S. CON. RES. 25

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I am here today on the floor again to ask that Senate Republicans stop blocking the next step in regular order and allow us to move to a bipartisan budget conference with the House of Representatives. We have waited long enough. In fact, we have now waited 54 days, and it is time to get to work on a bipartisan budget agreement.

The Senate Democrats see no reason for delay. We are very proud of our budget, which puts forward a strong, fair vision for getting Americans back

to work, tackling our long-term debt and deficit challenges, and laying a strong foundation for the middle class in the future. It seems that some of our Republican colleagues in the Senate and House would rather wait now until the next crisis and see if they can extract political concessions with the clock ticking—or maybe they don't want to air the details of the unpopular House budget.

Either way, there is no excuse for putting the American people through another round of partisan brinkmanship. We have already seen that that hurts our economy, and it causes Americans to question whether their government is working for them.

Yesterday the House Republicans met to talk about what they are going to demand in exchange for not tanking our economy. Apparently they are considering a "laundry list," including repealing ObamaCare—which the House will vote on, by the way, for the 37th time today—and restrictions on women's health choices.

House Republicans' practice of leveraging crises for their own gain died with the Boehner rule, and no amount of wishing is going to bring it back. House Republicans may think brinkmanship helps them win political fights, but it does not help the American families and communities we are here to serve.

I urge our Republican colleagues in the Senate to take a step toward a responsible bipartisan budget agreement and a step away from governing by crisis.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 33, H. Con. Res. 25; that the amendment which is at the desk, the text of S. Con. Res. 8, the budget resolution passed by the Senate, be inserted in lieu thereof; that H. Con. Res. 25, as amended, be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that the Senate insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate, all with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection to the request?

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, reserving the right to object, we want to proceed with this as well. We want a budget. It has been 4 years and it has been far too long. What we want to avoid is a deal negotiated behind closed doors, a backroom deal to raise the debt limit.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senator modify her request so that it not be in order for the Senate to consider a conference report that includes reconciliation instructions to raise the debt limit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Reserving the right to object, the Senator's request is asking to disregard what the Senate did on

those days—54 days ago—to go through over 100 amendments and defeat those amendments time and time again; to go to conference—not behind closed doors, I would add. A conference committee is a committee that is out in the public.

What is happening right now is closed-door agreements. What we are asking for is an open process where we are allowed to take the Senate-passed budget and the House-passed budget, go to conference, and find out where we can agree so we can put this behind us.

I object to the Senator's request and ask again for our unanimous consent request to move to budget conference, as we do in regular order, which is what the Republicans have been demanding for a very long time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Does the Senator from Utah object?

Mr. LEE. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, we have gone 4 years without a budget, and the Democratic Senate did act this year and passed a budget. The House has also passed a budget, and it is a historic proposal. It balances in 10 years, it does not raise taxes, and it increases spending every year by as much as 3 percent. It is the right way to go for America, and it is the kind of budget we should be talking about.

Chairman MURRAY has indicated we should go through regular order. But under regular order, what we should do is have the House budget at the desk right now. It is a responsible budget. Under regular order, the House budget should be brought to the floor under section 305(b) of the Congressional Budget Act. Then we can have full debate on that budget with 50 hours and the ability to offer amendments. I think this is what we should be doing.

Instead, our Democratic colleagues and Senator REID have offered consent requests that short-circuit the regular order. Their request would automatically bring the House budget off the calendar, replace it entirely with the Senate's own budget and assume it passes without a single minute of debate or without a single vote being taken. That is not the regular order.

Madam President, first, I ask unanimous consent that after my remarks Senator INHOFE be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I object. I wish to respond to the Senator.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to consideration of Calendar No. 33, H. Con. Res. 25, the House-passed budget resolution for fiscal year 2014.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, reserving the right to object, what the

Senator is requesting us to do is to take up the House-passed budget. Remember, we have passed a Senate budget here. We had 50 hours of debate, over 100 amendments were offered. We voted on all of them way into the wee hours, 5 or 6 o'clock in the morning, as everyone here will rightly remember. He is asking us to disregard all that action in the Senate, take up the House bill and have 50 hours more of debate, unlimited amendments, sitting here for weeks at a time again to go through all the amendments.

Madam President, that is a waste of taxpayer money and it is a waste of our time. We have done that work. It is time to go to conference.

Therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, it is my understanding that a colloquy is in order between Senator BLUMENTHAL and Senator LEE, but I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of that I be recognized and that following my remarks the Senator from Texas, Mr. CORNYN, be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Reserving the right to object, I believe I was listed in the queue a bit earlier than that, but I only have a 3- or 4-minute statement. I do not mind trading off, but I, similar to others, was told the time was right after the vote that I would be recognized.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to amend my unanimous consent request to include the 3-minute remarks of the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. I thank the Senator. But reserving the right to object, is that before or after the remarks of the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. INHOFE. That would be before the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. WARNER. I thank the Senator.

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

The Senator from Utah.

#### UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUESTS— S. RES. 133 and 134

Mr. LEE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the HELP Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 133; that the Senate proceed to its consideration; that the resolution be agreed to; the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I wish to point out that the incident that led to this resolution—the Kermit Gosnell prosecution—indeed resulted in a successful prosecution. He was con-

victed of three counts of first-degree murder and one count of involuntary manslaughter. That case is closed. The criminal justice system has done its part, and the three life sentences without the possibility of parole means that the interests there—the very important public interests—will be served and he will never again harm women, infants or anyone else through his version of medical practice, that distorted and unfortunate betrayal of trust that he called a medical practice.

We need very much to focus on the kind of abuse of trust—unsanitary, abusive, unsafe medical practices—across this country, no matter what kind of procedure is involved, and that is the reason I think this resolution is too narrow in its focus on violations of the standard of medical care when they occur in medical practice, which most certainly was involved in the Gosnell case and involved, unfortunately, in thousands of cases across the country every year.

As Senators, we have a responsibility to focus on that betrayal of trust and care when it occurs. That is the reason I have offered a resolution—S. Res. 134—to express the sense of the Senate that all incidents of abusive, unsanitary, illegal, unhealthful medical practices should be condemned and prevented, and the perpetrators should be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law, as Gosnell was.

There are, unfortunately, many instances already publicly disclosed of these abuses of standards, and one of them, for example, I cited on the floor just very recently—last week. I remind my colleagues of the Oklahoma dentist who exposed as many as 7,000 patients to the HIV and hepatitis B and C viruses through unsanitary practices. So far, 60 of his patients have tested positive for these viruses. Those are 60 people who trusted a health care provider in a position of authority to provide safe, quality care. Those patients now face life-threatening diseases. In Nevada, practitioners at an endoscopy center exposed 40,000 patients to hepatitis C through their unsanitary practices, which went on for years. My resolution speaks to these kinds of abuses—unsafe, unsanitary practices—no matter what the medical procedure involved may be. So I urge my colleagues to support my resolution, and I do object to the proposed resolution of the Senator from Utah.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the HELP Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 134, and the Senate proceed to its consideration; that the resolution be agreed to, the Blumenthal amendment to the preamble, which is at the desk, be agreed to, the preamble, as amended, be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard to the request of the Senator from Utah.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Connecticut?

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Reserving the right to object, the kind of abuse, the kind of betrayal of trust described in the resolution proposed by my friend and my colleague from Connecticut is different in kind from that described in my resolution. The kind of abuse involved in my resolution involves the intentional taking, the first-degree premeditated murder of a human life. I think that deserves its own consideration, and on that basis I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. If I may respond to my friend's remarks—and I certainly not only sympathize with his motivation but also with the result—I just think it is too narrow a result—to investigate one form of medical practice, no matter how egregious the violation of standard of care may be. In this instance, it involved murder. We can say it now, no longer with the word “alleged” before murder, as we did last week. It is now proven. It is heinous and unacceptable. But so are the practices that involve exposing patients to very severe illnesses; and, likewise, the nursing home director in California who inappropriately administered an antipsychotic medicine to residents simply for convenience and which resulted in the death of one patient. Those kinds of practices may be equally egregious in the results and impact they cause, and my resolution would be broader and more inclusive and fairer not only to those victims' families—and I want to express my sympathy to the families of those victims who were so deeply and irreparably harmed by Gosnell—but also with the families and victims of other kinds of medical malpractice and to respect the States that have an independent responsibility to ensure adherence with those standards of care and ought to have the ability to enforce their laws, which might be impeded by the resolution that has been offered by my friend from Utah.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, I rise to ask my colleagues once again to join me in expressing the sense of the Senate that governments at all levels have a compelling interest in preventing and punishing the practices of late-term abortions under unsafe, unsanitary, and illegal circumstances.

It seems as though every day we find new evidence that this problem is much bigger than we could have feared previously. Earlier this week, of course, Philadelphia abortion doctor Kermit Gosnell was convicted on three counts of first-degree murder for severing the spines of newborn infants, and one count of involuntary manslaughter for the death of a pregnant mother who came to see Dr. Gosnell for care.

The shocking details of the Gosnell case have, despite the best efforts of