

to send us over piecemeal pieces of legislation. Well, OK. We feel bad about the veterans—and we all do. I am the biggest veterans advocate in here. We will take care of them now. And, oh gosh, some of our constituents are mad because they have flown out here and the national museums aren't open, so we will open those, and on and on, whatever the cause of the day is. I guarantee that if we began to pass those piecemeal pieces of legislation, my moms and dads in Head Start would be at the end of the line and would never get funded. I am standing up for them today and saying: You are first in line too.

We are all in this together. We need the government open—all of our agencies. Everybody gets a chance and an opportunity in this country. And we are going to stick together and say to Speaker BOEHNER: Pass a clean CR, and then allow this country and this government and the American way of life to function as our forefathers said—by sitting down at a negotiating table and working out our differences. That is what I have asked for as chair of the Budget Committee 18 times now. It is what we need to say we are going to do again but not while our country is shut down, not while my families in Head Start are held hostage, not while our small businesses are held hostage, not while everybody in this country is looking at us, wondering how we ever got to this.

Open the government, and let's be responsible legislators. That is what I came here to do. I certainly know it is what the Presiding Officer came to do. And let's tell the kids in this country who are watching us today that this country can function, we can work as adults, and we have a responsibility to do that—here and abroad.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent there be a period of morning business for debate only until 2 p.m., with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, and the majority leader will be recognized at 2 p.m.

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

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. DURBIN. I ask the time used in quorum calls during this period of morning business be equally divided between Democrats and Republicans.

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

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. CORKER. Madam President, we find ourselves in a very predictable situation, and what is unpredictable is what our response to this situation is going to be. For some time I have talked about the box canyon that we were taking ourselves into, and I think it has now become very apparent to folks on both sides of the aisle that to overturn a central piece of legislation, it takes more than one-third of government to do so. When we have the presiding President over that piece of legislation, it actually takes two-thirds of each of the bodies to make that happen. I think people have realized that. It gives me no joy, but this is something I have obviously talked about for some time. Now we find ourselves in this box canyon.

What was also very predictable was that my friend TOM COBURN, the great Senator from Oklahoma, laid out very clearly on the Senate floor that even if there was a government shutdown, the health care bill would continue. I think what Americans are waking up to and seeing—even though Republicans have strongly opposed the health care bill at every turn—that even with government being shut down, the health care bill is continuing on and people around the country are signing up for what people call ObamaCare. So both of these were very predictable outcomes.

What is now unpredictable is what our response to that is going to be. I am speaking mostly to my friends on this side of the aisle. There has also been a number of people on the other side of the aisle who have spent a great deal of time over the last 2 or 3 years trying to focus on ways to reduce spending in the government and making our country stronger in the process.

I think to a person over here—as well as many on the other side of the aisle—we understand that our inability to

deal with the fiscal situation in which we find ourselves in this country has hurt us economically. People have not been willing to invest in capital investments within their companies and around the world in many cases because they don't know what is going to happen in our country.

I know first hand as the ranking member on Foreign Relations—and as I have traveled the world—there is no doubt it has affected us around the world. People really do not understand whether we are going to be able to meet the obligations we have made from a security standpoint.

Again, where we are today is very predictable, and I don't want to be crass. Obviously, I know this is creating a hardship for some people who have been furloughed, and it is certainly affecting people around our country, and that is obviously not good. On the other hand, if there is some way for some good policy outcome that strengthens our country over the longer haul, which is why we are all here, then that is a good trade-off. We will see what happens.

Here is my concern: While the situation we are in is very predictable—and many people in this body predicted we would end up exactly where we are today in this box canyon—we knew people would still sign up for the new health care law, which some have tried to defund, in spite of the fact that government has shut down.

What I am concerned about is this: We have made great strides as a nation, and in this body, to reduce government outlays we have control over. This has not happened in this Nation since 1955 and 1956. Two years ago we were at \$1.43 trillion in annual outlays from a discretionary standpoint, and that is what we deal with in a CR. Last year we were at \$988 billion, and this year—if we continue to uphold the law we put in place—we will be at \$967 billion.

That is a phenomenal result for us to have achieved in this body and for our country—to have achieved to strengthen our Nation. While there may be ways of changing the way those outlays are done—and maybe there is mandatory spending that is substituted for discretionary spending. Maybe there are ways of doing it to make it more sensible to people in this body. It is truly remarkable that Washington figured out a way to reduce the amount of spending that was taking place. I know we can figure out a way to do that even smarter.

Let me get to the unpredictable point. Sometimes when people find themselves in a box canyon or in a place that is difficult, they begin doing things that are not in the interest of themselves, and certainly not in the interest of the body that they represent. What I am worried about is that while so many people have been focused on this shiny thing over here and so much of the Nation's focus has been on this shiny thing over here, what people

have not been focused on, in the way I would hope, is the gains we have made in controlling spending as a nation. What I worry about—as it looks like we are now beginning to combine the continuing resolution process with the debt ceiling—is that people forget about the tremendous gains we have made in strengthening this Nation. While I am saying this to an empty Chamber, like most of us do when we speak on the Senate floor—and I know people are busy and have other things to do—my talk today is really focused on people in the other Chamber.

I know there is a lot that is happening over there. What I am worried about is that as the leadership over there tries to cobble together 218 votes to maybe do something relevant to the continuing resolution, and at the same time do something to the debt ceiling, that somehow or other—because we are in this boxed canyon that was very predictable—they deal away what we have gained.

What I hope we will do on this side—and to all of those—and there are many—on the other side who have fought so hard to try to get the momentum going so we will save our country from huge deficits down the road and do what we can to make sure we leave this country a better place for young people like these interns and pages here on the floor—of the aisle is keep our focus on the fact that whenever negotiations take place around a debt ceiling, they traditionally and always have been about making sure we are trying to do those things to keep us from having more debt down the road. We need to keep our eyes focused on the reforms that are necessary to keep that process going.

To be candid—and this is the first time I have said this publicly—to look at a continuing resolution at \$988 billion—I'm sorry. As it now is, the law says we would be spending—beginning a couple of days ago in this new year—at \$967 billion. I know the discussions here on the floor have been: Well, in 6 weeks the sequester—by the way, the sequester is that mechanism that was put in place during the Budget Control Act to continue to put downward pressure on spending—will kick in according to all of the discussions that have taken place.

I think most of us who have fought hard to try to save our Nation from these mounting deficits down the road were a little disappointed that we would be looking at extending last year's spending for 6 weeks, and really not taking ourselves down to \$967 billion. I realize what has happened. But here is my point to the other side of the building, the House: Whatever you have to do to cobble together 218 votes to pass a bill over there relative to maybe the CR and the debt ceiling, please do not negotiate away the hard-won gains we were able to put in place to reduce spending and help make our country stronger for the young people like those sitting in front of me. That is my message.

We are in a place that is very predictable. The outcome is unpredictable, but what I hope the outcome will be is an outcome that causes us not only not to deal away the gains that have been put in place, but to maybe put in place mandatory reforms that we all know need to occur to make this country stronger. There is tremendous bipartisan support.

In April the President laid out a budget that had a number of mandatory reforms that he was in agreement with. So what I hope will happen is we will keep the discretionary levels at levels we have already agreed to and we will take up some of those mandatory reforms that the President has already said he thinks are in the interest of our Nation and use those to help us raise the debt ceiling. As a result, we will have an outcome that causes this country to be stronger, causes this economy to grow, and over time causes us to continue to be able to honor the commitments we have made around the world.

With that I note absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, I had a great honor this morning, and it will change the nature of the remarks I intended to make on the Senate floor.

I just returned from the World War II Memorial. We had a group of 90 World War II veterans who flew here on an Honor Air flight. Honor Air is a national program. The funds for it are raised by friends, neighbors, and community individuals to help bring their World War II veterans to the Nation's Capital.

I have probably visited the World War II Memorial dozens of times—maybe 40 or 50. I visit it every time there is an Honor Air flight from my home State and I am in Washington, DC, I like to be there to say: Welcome and thank you. It is an honor to have you at the memorial that was built for you.

I visited the World War II Memorial. It is especially meaningful to me personally. My dad is a World War II veteran. My dad has been on the Honor Air flight. My dad will be 98 in November.

A few days before the World War II Memorial opened, I walked down there—I was a House Member then, not a Senator—and got a glimpse of what it was going to be like. It is a wonderful place and it reminds us of many things. That day, I stepped away from the memorial and used my cell phone to call my dad at home in Plainville, KS. I was fortunate I got the answering machine, because these are difficult

things to tell your parents. So I said: Dad, I am at the World War II Memorial. Thank you for your service to our country. I respect you and I love you. It was great to be able to say that to an answering machine instead of to your own parent.

My dad actually one-upped me. A few moments later my cell phone rang and he said: Gerald, I couldn't understand what you said.

So I repeated it in person.

The great thing about the memorial is it causes us to reflect and say things and express ourselves in ways that we otherwise would never do. So that memorial, as do others that honor our service men and women, is one that calls us to say we thank you for your service, we respect you, we love you. That was my experience again this morning.

Again, I try to be there every time a group of veterans comes from Kansas, and I was hoping today wouldn't be any different. With the shutdown of our government, with the funding on hold for the National Parks, there was some concern about whether these veterans would be able to actually get to the memorial. It all worked fine. I appreciate the way the morning's events transpired and there was no confrontation and no one wanted to deny those veterans their chance to visit their memorial for the first time.

In addition to those sentiments about these individual veterans, I think what may be of value as we approach today and tomorrow and try to find the solutions that are necessary to solve the circumstance we find ourselves in is a recognition that our veterans—I have had this thought every time I have walked to the Vietnam Wall or to the Korean War Memorial and now to this newer memorial, the World War II Memorial—not a single person represented on that wall or memorialized in the World War II Memorial or the Korean War Memorial, not one of them—I cannot imagine that a single one of them—volunteered or was drafted for purposes of a fight between Republicans and Democrats. No one went to serve our country, no one volunteered to serve our country because they believed in Republicans or they believed in Democrats. Knowing veterans as I do, my view is they answered the call to duty. They were willing to serve because they believed in America. They believed in the United States and our principles and the freedoms and liberties it provides, and they knew their service would make a difference in the lives of their kids and grandkids. They knew their service would help make America a better place for everyone, but certainly for people they knew—their family members.

I hope I can portray to my colleagues here in the Senate and here in this Capitol building and down Pennsylvania Avenue that the battles we engage in need to be a lot less about Republicans and Democrats and much

more about what is good for the country. We ought to use the veterans we met with this morning and those who are memorialized on the National Mall in every circumstance to remind ourselves that there is a higher calling to what we do in our Nation's Capital. There is something more important than political skirmishes.

I don't say this in any Pollyanna way. I don't say it in a way that doesn't acknowledge partisan differences. I always assumed and believed that America sent a variety of people to Washington, DC, to represent their interests and my State of Kansas will probably send somebody different than some other State. We all come here with a philosophy, a background of the way we grew up, the way we think about things, the instructions our constituents have given us, and all of that is reflected in the way we vote, the issues we pursue, the priorities we have. So it is not that we are all supposed to agree, but surely there ought to be a recognition that when there is disagreement, as there often is, there is a desire, just as our service men and women had to serve the country, much more important than the desire to serve our political party.

Today's trip to the World War II Memorial, while it is a common experience for me, was especially useful and meaningful because it happened at a time when these veterans came not knowing whether they would be able to gain entry to the memorial. Being there to encourage them and seeing them welcomed and greeted was important but, perhaps equally as important, it served as a reminder to me that what we do in the Senate is motivated by the best of intentions and the greatest of goals; the idea that America is a special place and we who serve here have a special responsibility. We have a chance to try to do something good for the country.

One of the things that has always inspired and pleased me about Kansas—and I assume it is true elsewhere—most of the conversations I have with folks back home are a lot less about what they want me to do for them but more about what decisions they want me to make, to make certain their kids and grandkids have a better life. There is something very great about how we have an interest—as human beings, as parents—in the well-being of the next generation and not just the well-being of ourselves. So my efforts in trying to find resolution to the circumstance we find ourselves in is strengthened, the resolve I have to try to work with others here in the Senate is one that is highlighted by my experience this morning at the National Mall.

I think about where we are and where we need to go. Again, having decried the high partisanship nature of this place, I don't want to detract from that, but we need to be able to have leaders who are willing to have discussions, conversations, and a coming together. It is true of Republicans and it

is true of Democrats and it is certainly true of whoever is the President of the United States. We need to make certain we have the ability to recognize that not all of us agree on everything, but with the efforts we make to find a solution to a problem, there is a coming together. It seems to me we have now gotten ourselves in this entrenched position. And while I was pleased moments ago to learn that our President has called congressional leaders to the White House, it is disturbing to me that the message is: But we are not negotiating. I am not certain what the purpose of the White House visit will be. I hope it results in movement, in success.

It is my understanding my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle have agreed this morning to "not negotiate." All I know about that is what I have read in the press. I don't—again, in an attempt to make certain this doesn't sound partisan and detract from what I was attempting to convey moments ago, we need to make certain Republicans understand we can make progress in the positions we hold even without getting everything we want.

So this experience I described of being a Senator—a Member of this great deliberative body—hasn't been my experience in the short time I have been a Member of the Senate. The idea that we can't negotiate seems to me to be contrary to the purpose of this historic body.

I hope the attitude and approach changes and every Senator recognizes it is not an all-or-nothing proposition. It is an opportunity for us to resolve differences and each find some satisfaction in moving in a direction or preserving the status quo, if that is one's position; that because America is a diverse place and that people care differently about different issues and have different opinions, we certainly have a responsibility to represent those views of the folks back home, but recognizing that the country doesn't always agree with us. Surely, there is that common ground, that opportunity to find solutions.

My call is for leadership—and by leadership I mean broadly all 100 of us; not leadership in the sense of someone who occupies a position of leadership beyond being a Member of the Senate but all of us—to find the leadership to find the necessary resolve to solve our country's problems.

The Affordable Care Act is a very controversial piece of legislation. It has been said here on the Senate floor: It is the law, it is not negotiable. That position doesn't make sense to me. In fact, the President has delayed, excluded, found exemptions for what is the law. So, surely, if the President can, for example, delay the implementation of the employer mandate, it is not outside of the realm—in fact, I would say it is the constitutional responsibility of Congress—to have the debate, discussion, and consideration of whether to delay the individual man-

date. It is the law of the land, but if the President can make changes to the law of the land, surely the body created by article I, the legislative branch, has that opportunity to do so as well. So it ought not be nonnegotiable.

It is time for the Senate to function. It is time for us as individual Senators to provide the leadership to resolve our problems.

In my view, we desperately need leadership from the President. While I have serious policy and philosophical disagreements with President Obama, my greatest complaint about his Presidency is his lack of leadership. We need somebody to rally us, to come together and find solutions to those problems, to better resolve our differences. Again, I don't want to detract from the observations about how partisan this place has become by talking about President Obama. In this case, he is a Democrat and I am a Republican, but regardless of who is the occupant of the White House, in order for the Congress to resolve difficult issues, it takes the leadership of a President.

My call is, as it was earlier to my colleagues in the Senate to provide leadership—I hope the President, in his meeting with the leadership of the Senate and House today, will provide the leadership necessary to help us move in the right direction and step back from the statement that while we are meeting, nothing is negotiable.

I appreciate the opportunity to address the Senate and I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MANCHIN. First, I wish to apologize to the people of West Virginia. I am embarrassed and ashamed as a Senator and Member of Congress by how we are acting. I have been answering phones in my office. They are upset. I said: Well, you are not as upset as I am. I have a front-row seat, and it is not pretty.

This is not what we were sent here to do. It is not what I signed up for. It is not why I asked the people in West Virginia to allow me to represent what I consider to be the greatest State in the Nation, and I am sure each Senator feels the same way about their State and its wonderful people. I have always looked at public service as an opportunity to fix problems, to make life better, to be able to use the wisdom and skills we have obtained through our experiences in life and watching people and the compassion we have for people to try to make it better.

Shutting down government is simply unacceptable. I don't care what way a person looks at this, it is unacceptable.

This is the first time in 17 years that our government is not open for business—the first time in 17 years we are not open. This is self-inflicted. This did not happen by any outside forces. This has all been self-inflicted. It not only hurts the people of West Virginia deeply, it hurts people all over this country, and they are feeling the effects. This is only the second day, but it is 2 days too long.

Most of you know I am pretty moderate. I am very conservative on fiscal issues. This is how we were raised. We were expected to pay our bills, to take care of our debts, and take care of ourselves and our families. So I have watched that very carefully.

When I became Governor, the first thing I did was I tried to put our financial house in order in West Virginia so that basically we could take care of our values. That was our priority, based on what we wanted—our children to have opportunities. We never cut any services during the recession. We took care of our seniors with the dignity and respect and pride they should have. We took care of our veterans. We could not be everything to everybody, but we really watched our dollars and got our financial house in order. So I look at it from that standpoint, where I come from, as a proud West Virginia Democrat, but I am also very compassionate on social issues. Watching my grandparents and watching my family in the little town of Farmington, WV, where I grew up, people expected you to do things. They expected you to really chip in and help people, but they expected you to help yourself also, and they expected you to take care of those who could not, the less fortunate. I have always taken that with me in every aspect of public service.

I think I am reasonable and willing to compromise and work with anybody on any issue. I have always put my State's interests ahead of my party politics. I do not make any excuses. I really believe I am an absolutely privileged person to be living in the greatest country on Earth and to be a member of a great family in the great State of West Virginia. But I am an American, I am a West Virginian, and then I am a Democrat in West Virginia, and I have dear friends who are Republicans from West Virginia and from all over the country.

So when I looked at the cause of this problem we have right now, it is about finances, strictly about finances. Can we continue to pay? I also looked at the way I felt Democrats truly looked at this. They said: Fine, we will agree to the \$986 billion number—\$986 billion. That was the Republicans' request, to keep that spending level. The Democrats would have loved to have \$1.058 trillion. They reduced it \$90 billion. To me, that was a good compromise. We can live with that \$986 billion number. We have to tighten our belts a little bit, but we are good at that in West Virginia. And we did it.

Then, all of a sudden, the Affordable Care Act—or ObamaCare, as people have referred to it—becomes the issue. There are a lot of things in that piece of legislation that I do not agree with. I do not know how I would have voted if I had been here. I would have tried to make what I would have thought were constructive changes. But do you know what. It is the law. And I said: I am in a mode that I would call for a reform, repair, and then repeal parts of it we

cannot fix. I do not know that yet. We have to get in there and do it.

I am probably part of the problem and caused some of this because I made a statement. We were talking to some people, and they asked me: What do you think is going to happen?

I said: Well, for my colleagues and friends on the other side of the aisle—my Republican friends—I would think they would look, and if they really want to talk about health care, can it be extended for 1 year before it takes effect as the law.

I did not mean to postpone it. I did not mean to stop and don't start it until next year. I meant the fines and the penalties.

Think about this. I am very much opposed to the individual mandate, but I understand it is part of the process. But I would have thought, why wouldn't we have a transition year?

So the law took effect as of yesterday. It has. We have people trying to find the best opportunity they have. In my little State, we do not have a lot of options, so I want to make sure the people who have good insurance are somehow able to keep that. There has to be a way we can work through that. I want to make sure the people who have no insurance and have never been able to buy insurance can now be able to afford it. I want to make sure of that. I want to make sure people who had a preexisting condition or had a child who was born with a condition are able to keep the insurance they now have that they could not have before. I want to make sure that basically the senior citizens in West Virginia, who basically are filling the doughnut hole out of their pockets, which they cannot afford, are taken care of. They can go get an exam on an annual basis and not have to pay a co-payment from their Medicare. Those are all good things, and I know my good friends on the Republican side feel the same way about some of this. Why would you want to throw the baby out with the bathwater when all you have to do is maybe change the water every now and then and we have a little clean water we can bathe the baby in again? These are sensible solutions, like how I was raised, looking at how do you fix it?

I can assure you this: I have never fixed a problem by calling somebody else a name. I have never chastised somebody for their beliefs. I really have not. I have tried to think, OK, if I were in their shoes, how could we fix this?

When I was Governor, I used to sit down with people on the opposite side and think, OK, in the profession we are in—public service—how do I allow them to go home to save face? How do I allow them to have some comfort that they are going to be able to bring constructive ideas to the table that basically make it better? I have always thought of that.

So you are not going to hear me saying that we are right and they are

wrong. In this case here, I will say: Please, don't have this self-inflicted pain on the people of my State of West Virginia or your State or this country. There could be a time when we might not be able to stop what might be happening. The market forces might push us in a direction that we cannot control. This is something we can control, and all we are asking for—please, let government continue. If you want to talk about a big, grand plan, which I hope we do, which is fixing the financial condition, getting our financial house in order, I have been a big supporter of Bowles-Simpson. It is the only bipartisan package that has been on the table since I have been here. There are an awful lot of things of which people say: Well, I don't like this, I don't like that. None of them have said it is not what needs to be done. It is a three-pronged approach. That is the big fix we have talked about. But we are not talking about any of that. We are talking about things we do not like. We are talking about people we do not like. We are calling people names. And it just does not fix things. It does not make it right. So you will hear me continue to talk about the grand bargain. This is the time, between now and the debt ceiling.

I will say this about the debt ceiling: Raising the debt does not fix the debt. We need to have a path to fix it. We should not be going through this political fight every 3, 6 months. This is the fifth time I have been in a debt ceiling debate. How many times have we voted on the so-called ObamaCare? It is ridiculous to continue to fight the same fight over and over.

I hope we are in a reform or repair, and then repeal when you cannot fix it. When you have given it your all for the betterment of your country and it is just not fixable or doable, then you change. We have not gotten there yet. We have all naysayers and people basically who just do not want change. I have too many people who need the services of government. I have too many people who depend on it—not that I believe people should be dependent. I hope people would be independent. But government is so intertwined in all of our lives, and to just say you want to stop it all is wrong.

So I would ask my dear friends and my colleagues on the Republican side to please think about a continuing resolution. Please. We have come to the agreement on the number that you wanted of \$986 billion. Health care—if you wanted to bring up the Keystone Pipeline, I am a total supporter of the Keystone Pipeline for energy independence. I am an "all energy" person—use whatever we have. It is not the place for it. As much as I would like to see it, it is not the place for me to draw the line to inflict so much pain on so many Americans, so many West Virginians, just because of one issue I like or do not like. There is a time for that. There will be a time for this health

care bill, ObamaCare. It will either succeed or fail on its own. But we ought to try to make it better if we can. If we cannot, then come to the conclusion we cannot, but do not shut down government because you do not think it will work—or maybe you are afraid it will work. That could be it too.

With all that being said, I say to my friends, you will never hear me say anything derogatory about you. You can always reach across the aisle to me. I am always going to sit down and talk to you. I am willing to compromise and work on any issue that betters the position we have, that betters the quality of life, that creates opportunities, that makes us the strongest and most powerful Nation on Earth. I will continue to fight for that. But I am asking you for this time, do not allow this self-inflicted pain to continue. This is not fair to my State, it is not fair to the people of West Virginia, it is not fair to the Presiding Officer's State of Wisconsin or to anybody in this great country of ours.

With that, Madam President, I say thank you for allowing me to say what has been on my mind. I am a proud American, and it is about this country first, and it is always going to be about this country first. If the United States of America does well, I will guarantee you the great State of West Virginia is going to be just great, we are going to do fine. But we have to work together and put our priorities in place.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Madam President, first of all, I want to commend the words of my colleague from West Virginia about, first of all, the frustration that so many Americans feel that we share and also his words about trying to come to a resolution. I think it bears repeating.

The main purpose of my remarks today will be focused, really, on one central theme; that is, in the House right now Speaker BOEHNER could put a bill on the floor that would open the government after a House vote. I am holding in my hand the bill that would do that. This is the bill that passed on Friday. It is amendment No. 1974 to H.J. Res. 59. This is the bill that, if the Speaker were to put it on the floor, would pass overwhelmingly. But you would get not just one side of the aisle, it would be a bipartisan vote to pass that bill, and upon passage, then, of course, getting the bill to the President for signature. So within however long it takes for the House to complete a vote—a rule and maybe two votes—and then getting it to the President, this could be over. And it should be over.

We should open the government. This is the way to do it—a bill that does not have anything attached to it. It just funds the government. I would hope the Speaker at long last would put that bill on the floor. We are hearing voices

that are bipartisan today asking for the Speaker to do just that. We have also heard a lot of talk about negotiation and compromise, and it is good that people are talking about that. But I hope some of our Republican friends talk about it with a degree of faithfulness to the facts or add adherence to the facts about what has happened over the last couple of months.

In an effort to reach an agreement that would avoid the shutdown—going back now a number of weeks and even months—Democrats here in the Senate and in the House as well accepted some of the very difficult so-called sequestration cuts. What do I mean by that? I mean the across-the-board indiscriminate cuts that went into effect in 2013 and were, unfortunately, a carryover from a battle and a fight in the summer of 2011. So we have accepted those difficult cuts in this budget negotiation in the so-called continuing resolution—meaning the bill that would keep the government operating, the one I just held up—as a compromise. This happened a while back.

I mentioned that last Friday, September 27, the Senate passed the so-called clean continuing resolution, which is just a fancy way of saying a budget bill without add-ons—nothing about any other issue, just a bill to fund the government. That bill—the one I referred to earlier that passed the Senate on the 27th and is sitting over in the House—would open the government and continue funding for the government until the middle of November so we get past this crisis, we do not have this as a problem in the next debate about paying our bills, and we can have a big debate in November about making sure we can pay for government operations.

What we should do as well, as we are debating in November—I hope we can get there, but as we are debating that, we should figure out a way—this is a bipartisan concern—to shut off, to turn off at least for 2 years the across-the-board cuts with which I think both parties have real disagreement. But the key is passing this in the House, this measure that will end the crisis, open the government.

When we passed it here in the Senate, we accepted those levels of spending, which are significantly less than Democrats would have hoped for, would have wanted. We accepted those despite the fact that we reversed the sequester in the budget we passed this spring. So we had a long budget debate here and, some might remember, last spring voted well into the early morning hours. I think our last vote was at 4 or 5 in the morning.

That was a higher number than we have agreed to already. So Democrats have compromised substantially already on the spending level. That does not seem to get reported very often. The bill that passed the Senate last Friday is a \$70 billion cut from the last fiscal year, 2013, the levels that were enacted spending levels—enacted fiscal

year 2013 before the across-the-board cuts went into effect.

To restate, this legislation which is in the House right now and they could pass with overwhelming bipartisan support, and it would open the government and end this crisis—they could do it this afternoon. They could do it this evening. They could do it without a lot of trouble if they put this bill on the floor. It does not mean all Republicans have to vote for it. The Speaker himself could vote against it. But putting it on the floor and having an up-or-down vote I think would be good for everyone.

It would end this crisis, open the government, and then we could begin to work on what I think the American people want us working on. They expect us to keep the government open. That is fundamental. But I think they expect us as well to work on strategies to create jobs or at least put into effect strategies that will lead to job creation.

I will say it again: This bill that is sitting in the House is not just a bill that will open the government, it will have overwhelming bipartisan support there. The bill is \$70 billion less than what we wanted. To say that is a compromise is an understatement. On the main issue before us, how do you fund the government, how much in terms of dollars do you direct toward the operations of the government, we have already compromised a long time ago to reduce that number by \$70 billion.

So when our friends are saying Democrats are not negotiating or compromising, my goodness, we compromised on day 1. They prevailed in that debate. We decided it is better to compromise in that number and keep the government operating and move the process along in terms of the budget, rather than shutting the government down to get our way.

Some Democrats may have said to us: You know what. You should have taken this part and not accepted those cuts, and maybe even take it as far as some Republicans want to take the debate on health care and shut the government down. We said: That does not make any sense. It is bad for the economy. It is bad for vulnerable people. It is bad for national security and a whole host of other reasons which I will mention in a minute, to shut down the government.

So from the beginning, we were not only willing to compromise and negotiate, we have already done it in a very substantial way on the core issue, which is the budget and the number. For them to say: Well, we are not going to insist that the government stay open, and then they want to have some negotiation about that does not make a lot of sense, does it, when you consider the compromises we have already made?

I think the fundamental thing the American people want us to do is open the government. The key to opening the government is not only sitting in

the House, the key is already in the lock. All the Speaker has to do is turn it ever so slightly—turn that key. The turning of the key is this bill. If this bill goes on the floor of the House of Representatives today, tomorrow morning, tomorrow afternoon, tonight, whenever, it will pass with overwhelming bipartisan support.

I will come back to that in a moment. But I think the question of compromise is, frankly, weighted to our side. I think we have already made a substantial and significant compromise in the negotiation, and that was done a long time ago. I think at this point, when it comes to the question, some Members of the House have tried to do, to bring us to this point where there is a shutdown, I think their actions are, in a word, irresponsible. I think a lot of Americans expect they would act in a more responsible manner. By pushing an agenda that has now led to a government shutdown, in addition to being irresponsible or a dereliction of their duty, is also reckless.

This is a reckless step to take just to make a point about health care, about anything else. There are a lot of us who would like to have our arguments litigated or debated in a way that gets a lot of attention paid to it. But to take it this far, where you are literally willing to take an action which leads, as this has done, to a government shutdown, is both irresponsible and reckless.

I think we are just beginning now, in these hours—and now unfortunately we are into the second day—we are now just beginning to understand the impact this is having on Americans. But in the case of Pennsylvania, we are just beginning to hear the impact on individual Pennsylvanians.

This morning I learned that Bushkill Outreach, a food pantry located in the Delaware Water Gap Recreational Area, is closed because it is on Federal land operated by the National Park Service.

When you close a national park area or a national park itself, you are not just impacting what happens there and the opportunity for people to tour a national park or to recreate, you are actually having an adverse impact, in this case on a food pantry. This particular food pantry, Bushkill Outreach, feeds 30 families per day, amounting to 120 people per day and 1,200 people per month. Imagine that. You have a group of Members of Congress in Washington who believe their ideological point of view on one issue is so compelling and so important to the country that they are willing to shut the government down and deny those 30 families the opportunity to have the benefit of a food pantry in a still tough economy.

We have had, fortunately, a lot of job growth over the last several years. We are happy about that. We are happy that the economy is moving in the right direction on job growth. But it is not moving fast enough for Pennsylvania. In this sense, we have hovered

around half a million people for too long. It was well above 500,000 people. Fortunately, it came down below half a million. But it has begun to creep up again. Once again, Pennsylvania has an unemployment number which is just at about 501,000 people.

In my home area, northeastern Pennsylvania, we saw data today—unfortunately in my home county, Lackawanna County, and the county next door, Luzerne County, at least one, maybe two more, in that region of the State, including the region where Bushkill Outreach is—the unemployment rate in several of those counties is more than 9 percent.

So there a food pantry is not just a place for people who are particularly vulnerable; those are people who have been vulnerable, because of job loss, because of the economy. The shutdown has two adverse impacts on those families. It has a direct impact on their ability to access food every day. That is horrific enough. Talk about direct and substantial pain, physical pain on an individual or family. But it also has another impact when they shut the government down, certainly over a long period of time for sure—and this is irrefutable—you injure the national economy. When you injure the national economy, you make it less likely that those people who have to access food banks can actually get a job in northeastern Pennsylvania or anywhere else in the country.

This is about real life. This is not some Washington theoretical debate. There are thousands of reasons to open up the government. I say to the Speaker of the House: Get this bill on the floor, and the food pantry will no longer be adversely impacted. Our national security will no longer be adversely impacted if we can open the government up again. A lot of the folks who access this food bank are on fixed incomes, so it has a detrimental effect on them.

How about national security? The shutdown is having a direct and substantial impact on national security. Our colleague Senator FEINSTEIN was on the floor yesterday and spoke of the critical impact the shutdown is having on the intelligence community. As many Americans know, intelligence gathering is not just the CIA, it is a whole range of agencies that gather intelligence which arms us with information to protect ourselves and to be able to protect ourselves from terrorist threats.

In the intelligence community, meaning all of the Federal agencies that gather intelligence to protect us, 72 percent of the civilian work force is furloughed. It is hard to comprehend the adverse impact of that. This means the bulk of Federal employees who gather critical intelligence and work with law enforcement agencies are not working during the shutdown.

You have to ask yourself at this point—if you are a Member of the House or the Senate who believes that

the point you want to make on health care or anything else that has led to this shutdown—do you really want to maintain that position, that your point is so important and so compelling that you are willing to allow a shutdown to take place and to continue and allow the number I read, 72 percent of the civilian workforce in the intelligence community, to be furloughed? It puts at risk our soldiers, the fighting men and women on battlefields around the world or in danger zones, it puts at risk our diplomatic personnel, and at some level at some point in time puts Americans at risk because you cannot stop terrorism. You cannot arm yourself against terrorist attacks unless you have information. You do not get the information unless you have the full means of intelligence gathering. So I hope folks would ask themselves: Is my ideological point of view on this or that issue important enough that we should have a government shutdown in place which injures our ability in gathering intelligence for national security? I hope people would ask themselves that question and see what the answer would be.

I have also heard, when you tell people about the furloughs, I have heard some Republicans—not all, a few—make the argument that somehow the President is making the decision about furloughs that adversely impact national security and he is making a mistake when he does that, he or his administration, or that maybe Members of Congress are somehow part of the decision on furloughs that would adversely impact national security.

Look, every Member of Congress is exposed to intelligence. Every Member of Congress has an opportunity to take action on national security and intelligence. Every Member of Congress has an opportunity to say things about decisions that impact national security. But I would say this to my Republican friends: If the charge is the President and his administration are making decisions about furloughs that somehow compromise our national security, if you are going to assert that—you are free to do it; it is a free country—but if you are going to assert that, you should have proof. If you are going to make a charge like that against any President, or, frankly, any Member of Congress, Democrat or Republican, you have got to have proof there. So I would hope the media—when someone makes that charge against the Commander in Chief, I would hope that Member of Congress would have in their hand the proof, a document, a statement, something they can put on the table and say that is the proof. Because if you are going to make a charge which is that serious, in such a grave matter of national security, you have got to prove it. If you cannot prove it, you should keep your mouth shut and not make that charge. So I hope when people say somehow this furlough number—I have heard people say: That is support personnel in the intel community; you really do not need those

folks. If you are going to contest the number and say our national security is okay during the furlough, during a shutdown, you have got to prove it.

A lot of things people say in Washington are part of the political debate, but if one is going to accuse someone of taking an action that would undermine national security, one should have to prove it.

Why do I say that? I spent 6½ years on the Foreign Relations Committee. I have traveled to the Middle East several times, to Pakistan three times, to Afghanistan three times, and to Iraq twice. In regions of the world where our national security interests are directly at stake, we have personnel—either uniformed or diplomatic personnel. I have seen directly how much people can be at risk at those postings in embassies, consulates, and how dependent they are on having marines or literally soldiers to protect the embassy or a consulate, but how dependent they are on good intelligence.

There are a lot of reasons to open the government. There are a lot of reasons for the House to vote on this today and open the government, but there are few as compelling as national security and intelligence.

I wish to go through a list of impacts that the shutdown is having.

We know that the shutdown has an impact on small businesses. Why do we know that? Well, the SBA on a weekly basis provides help to many small businesses across the country. We know that more than 1,000 businesses a week could see their critical financial support deferred until the government opens again. It is bad for small business for the government to be shut down.

A shutdown would end nutrition support for pregnant women and children, the Women, Infants and Children Program, WIC. WIC is the acronym we frequently hear. It is a great program. In the event of a shutdown such as we are living through now, WIC will only be able to continue serving participants for 1 week. We are in day 2 of the shutdown. After 1 week, they would have to stop serving participants.

What are the numbers here? The basic numbers from fiscal year 2012 are that the average monthly participation totaled more than 8.9 million people. Of that 8.9 million, 4.7 million are children and 2.1 million are infants. This is another good reason to pass this bill in the House today with a quick vote. It would be overwhelmingly bipartisan. In addition to national security and intelligence, this would make sure that the WIC Program will serve people who need it.

A government shutdown would compromise public health. Why do I say that? In the shutdown, 70 percent of NIH employees would be furloughed. This is the National Institutes of Health which does research on all kinds of diseases and ailments. It is the envy of the world. No other country in the world has anything equivalent to

the National Institutes of Health, but a shutdown will lead to the furlough of 70 percent of their employees. That is another reason.

As we heard on the news this morning, there is a lot of reporting about the Centers for Disease Control. It is also adversely affected in the shutdown.

A shutdown also compromises school readiness for young children. A government shutdown delays funding for 22 Head Start providers across the country, jeopardizing early childhood education care for the 18,000 children and families those programs serve. We are speaking about 22 providers for Head Start not being able to provide services for 18,000 children and families.

Finally, a shutdown endangers benefits owed to our veterans. The Veterans' Administration will run out of money to pay mandatory benefits for existing beneficiaries by the end of this month. I know we have heard people saying: Well, this check or that check will not be stopped. Ultimately, there is going to be a direct impact if the shutdown is continuous.

I would say to our friends in the House they can take action right now to prevent this from happening. How may they do that? It is very simple. All they need to do is take the bill sitting there and put it on floor. A lot of people can vote against it, but the vote for it would be overwhelming.

If Speaker BOEHNER puts that on the floor today, tonight or tomorrow—he should do it tonight—we can be beyond this. According to a new report in the National Review there are potentially more than 100 House Republicans who would be open to a so-called clean CR. When we hear that, this is a clean bill to fund the government. It doesn't have anything attached to it. It includes the \$70 billion compromise Democrats have already agreed to by reducing the overall cost of the funding of the government.

I hope we could end the shutdown today by having the House adopt this legislation. I urge the Speaker to put the bill on floor for a vote in the House today.

I wish to conclude with some separate remarks related to the shutdown, but they are also related, unfortunately, to a lot of other budget items. I wanted to do this the other day and want to put it on the record.

In addition to everything else I have spoken about, during the shutdown over 30,000 correctional officers in our Federal prisons report to work not knowing when they will receive their next paycheck. These are officers who put their lives at risk every day and deserve to know when they will be paid. During the last shutdown in the midnineties, some guards went well over a month without being paid. These men and women are literally putting their lives on the line every day. Yesterday, I was scheduled to be at an event with a number of families who have been directly impacted by

the violence that is perpetrated against corrections officers, but I couldn't be there because it was at the same time as our 9:30 vote on the budget trying to reverse the shutdown.

I was supposed to meet with Don and Jean Williams, the parents of Eric Williams, who lost his life as a corrections officer. Officer Williams lost his life performing his duties at a U.S. penitentiary in northeastern Pennsylvania, my home area. I was able to meet his parents briefly at his viewing. That is real life for the Williams family.

Unfortunately, they were not the only family represented at the event yesterday. There were several other families who had lost loved ones in that way.

I am not sure I had a full appreciation for this before I was elected to the Senate. We have corrections officers in Pennsylvania in our State system. I had some exposure to their work, but it wasn't until I spent a lot of time talking to corrections officers at the Federal level that I learned the gravity of this problem. It is a problem with multiple elements.

One, of course, is an erosion of support for corrections officers over time, so that over time the ratio of one corrections officer to inmates has grown. To say they have grown to dangerous proportions is an understatement.

One of the reasons Officer Williams lost his life is because often these officers are in situations where they are outnumbered, sometimes by hundreds of inmates. They, of course, can't carry a weapon. The tragedy officer Eric Williams suffered, and the tragedy others have suffered, serves as a stark reminder of the risks that corrections officers and staff face every day.

Budget cuts over time, with across-the-board-cuts from sequestration, plus a shutdown leads to a very dangerous situation for corrections officers. We need to address their concerns and these issues as part of this overall debate about the budget.

In conclusion, I reiterate that I hope the House will take up the bill that can end this crisis and open the government.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, today we continue to find ourselves in the unfortunate position of a partial government shutdown. Following a veto threat from the President, last night Democrats in the House of Representatives killed three spending bills that would have funded parks and monuments, veterans programs, and the DC government. Senate Democrats have already rejected four House-passed proposals that would have provided Americans with relief from ObamaCare while

ensuring that government operations continued. Senate Democrats even rejected one proposal that would have sent the two Chambers to conference—the House and Senate—to work out some sort of a solution to this standoff we find ourselves in, but they haven't even been willing to talk. In fact, when that request from the House came to the Senate to create a conference that would allow the House and Senate to come together to try to find a solution, it was tabled. It was soundly rejected—tabled—by the Democrats here in the Senate.

So we are continuing in this holding pattern as the House continues to send proposals over and they continue to be rejected by the Senate, with Senate Democrats not even wanting to sit down and talk with the House about how we might resolve this.

I am happy to hear the President has, after a week of essentially ignoring congressional Republicans, called the leaders to the White House tonight. I am a little confused, however, about the purpose of the meeting, as the White House continues to say they are not going to negotiate. I hope the President does change his mind on that, that he is evolving on it, and that he will at this meeting express a willingness to work with Republicans because it really is important for the President to be engaged in this process.

I can't imagine a scenario where we have consequences such as these, with a continuing funding resolution still not approved, a partial government shutdown, a debt limit coming up in the middle of the month, and the President essentially saying: I am not going to negotiate. I am not going to negotiate on any of this.

I think that is a position that is completely unreasonable, and I think the American people find it to be completely unreasonable as well.

In the meantime, we have an opportunity now to address some of the concerns that have been raised by people about various parts of our government that as a result of this unnecessary shutdown are not open. So Republicans continue to try to work to open government and at the same time to provide ObamaCare fairness for all.

I have said this before, but I get the sense some of our colleagues on the Democratic side and the President seem to be content with shutting down the government. Well, we Republicans are not. We are consistently trying to come up with solutions.

The House of Representatives will be meeting today, and they are going to be voting again on some of the same proposals that were voted down last night by House Democrats. They are commonsense spending bills that would ensure that important functions of government can resume. These bills would ensure that benefits for our Nation's veterans continue uninterrupted, they would allow our members of the National Guard and Reserve to be paid, and they would provide funding for the

National Institutes of Health to ensure this senseless shutdown does not prevent patients from receiving lifesaving treatments.

I will explain briefly what some of these bills would do that are going to be coming over later today from the House of Representatives to the Senate, where, at least to date, none of the proposals that have been advanced by the House of Representatives have been accepted here in the Senate. They have been tabled by the majority leader. That is unfortunate because it is the essence of what the American people believe we ought to be doing, which is working together, coming together to find a solution to some of these big problems. Unfortunately, as I said before, when the request came over to go to conference with the House, that was tabled as well. So there has been no discussion, no willingness to talk, no willingness to think and cooperate in a way that would help us get the fundamental operations of government up and running again.

Anyway, these bills are going to come over from the House today, and they follow, as I said, the same track they tried to get approved last night. One deals with the availability through the annual appropriations process of the Department of Veterans Affairs to continue to serve veterans—namely, veterans' disability payments, the GI bill, education and training, and VA home loans—under the same conditions that were in effect at the end of the just-completed fiscal year. In other words, it would take all those programs that benefit veterans and make sure they continue uninterrupted and are funded just as they were at the end of the fiscal year until such time as Congress can come up with a longer term solution. That might be an appropriations bill—which, frankly, should have been passed much earlier this year and wasn't because none of the appropriations bills were moved here in the Senate—or another temporary funding measure, such as a continuing resolution, that is put forward. A similar proposal was introduced by a number of Senate Democrats. So when it comes over from the House of Representatives today, I hope we will have broad bipartisan support in the Senate for making sure veterans programs are continued and are funded.

There is also going to be a bill coming over that deals with national parks and museums, and it would provide immediate funding for National Park Service operations, the Smithsonian, the National Gallery of Art, and the U.S. Holocaust Museum at the same rate and under the same conditions as were in effect at the end of the just-completed fiscal year. So the same thing I mentioned with regard to the veterans programs—these functions of government would be funded at the same level they were at the end of the year we just completed until such time as an appropriations bill is passed or a temporary funding measure is put in place.

That was something the House voted on yesterday, and it was defeated. I shouldn't say Democrats universally defeated it, but almost so when that measure was brought up yesterday. Hopefully, today they will get a different outcome in the House. I think they will, and it will come over to the Senate.

Another bill the House will move today will provide for the immediate availability of local funds—which are subject to the control of Congress through the annual appropriations process—for the District of Columbia, again under the same conditions as were in effect at the end of the just-completed fiscal year.

Finally, there will be a bill that comes over from the House that provides funding for the pay and allowances of military personnel in the reserve component who are in active status. So it will fund the Guard and Reserve. Those funds would be made available at the same level as the just completed fiscal year until such time as Congress takes more formal action.

Finally, there will be a fifth bill coming from the House that will provide immediate funding for the National Institutes of Health at the same rate and under the same conditions as in effect at the end of the just completed fiscal year. So the important work done by the National Institutes of Health will continue—if the bill is enacted here in the Senate—and go on even in the midst of a partial shutdown.

What I am saying is Republicans are trying to address all of these concerns that we have about various elements of our government that are not functioning today because of this partial shutdown. Last night they were met with resistance in the House of Representatives and they were voted down by Democrats. We are hoping for and I think we will have a different outcome today in the House of Representatives, at which point those bills will come here to the Senate.

So if the Senate is interested in going on the record and making sure there is funding available for veterans programs, for the museums and our monuments, for our Guard and Reserve, for the National Institutes of Health, and for the District of Columbia—which is under the jurisdiction of the Congress when it comes to funding—the Senate should vote affirmatively and actually ensure that those important functions of our government are addressed and funded.

What I am simply saying is that time and time again the House of Representatives has sent to the Senate legislation—measures—that would continue to fund the government, and in earlier cases when they came over here addressed what I think the American people have said they want to see addressed in ObamaCare.

The President of the United States has granted a 1-year delay to employers in this country from the employer mandate. So essentially he gave a

delay—a waiver—to big business. The House of Representatives in one of the bills they sent to the Senate said we ought to in fairness give the same break to individuals. There is an individual mandate in the ObamaCare law that kicks in, and we ought to be able to give individuals in this country the same treatment that we give to big businesses. So as a matter of fairness that was proposed by the House of Representatives.

When that bill came over, it also included a provision that would ensure that Members of Congress and their staffs and the staffs at the President's office and in the executive branch of the government are all subject to the same law and to the same provisions—that the ObamaCare law is applied in the same way as to other Americans. So we had a 1-year delay—a temporary relief from the individual mandate—included in that, and a provision that ensured that those of us here and our staffs and members of the executive branch are treated the same way as are other Americans. That too was tabled in the Senate.

It strikes me that as we think about the impact of this law, we ought to ensure that middle-class Americans deserve the same relief that the President and Democrats here in the Senate have already given to Members of Congress and to their staffs, as well as to big businesses in this country.

We had an opportunity to do that the other night. That was rejected by the Senate. I think the question that every American ought to be asking is, Why wouldn't Democratic Senators give the same break to the American people that big businesses have received? I would again argue this is an issue of basic fairness. We think it ought to be delayed for all Americans, not just for the favored few.

There is bipartisan support for this. I mentioned before that we have a Democratic Senator in the Senate who has said a delay in the individual mandate is a very reasonable and sensible approach. I hope at some point that view will start to spread to others, and we will be able to actually provide some relief to the American people from the harmful effects of ObamaCare.

But at least while we are in this period, as this continues to be discussed and hopefully, eventually a solution reached, we ought to be protecting those Americans who are being hit by the shutdown.

When these bills come over from the House of Representatives today, I hope the Senate will pick them up quickly and act on them.

We had an example or incident yesterday where a number of World War II veterans came here to Washington, DC, as Honor Flight guests. This is an organization that brings World War II veterans here to see their monument—the World War II monument—here in Washington, and they couldn't get access to it because of the shutdown. That should be unacceptable to every

American. We need to ensure that never happens again.

There was even reporting that they had made a request of the administration to be able to go there and they were turned down. I can't imagine turning down a group of World War II veterans who simply wanted to see and have access to the very memorial for which they fought and defended our country.

So those are the types of things that action taken by the Senate here could prevent, if in fact when these bills come over from the House of Representatives the Senate will act in an expeditious way, pick up those bills and pass them, so we can ensure that people have access to those types of monuments and memorials. We can ensure that veterans programs continue to be funded and operational. We can ensure the National Institutes of Health and the important work that it does continues, and we can ensure that our National Guard and Reserve also are funded through this time. It strikes me that is a very commonsense way to approach the situation in which we find ourselves today.

I hope that at the end of the day we can come to some resolution that would allow the government to be funded on a more sustainable basis. I think when we continue to do these things on a short-term basis, it is not a good way to govern a country as large as ours. We can do better. The American people deserve better. But at least, at a minimum, until we get that broader issue resolved, we ought to work and ensure that veterans and members of the Guard and Reserve, people who are visiting our country wanting to see the memorials and museums and that sort of thing have the opportunity to do that. We can do that today by picking up and passing the bills coming over from the House of Representatives.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, let me review where we are.

Listening to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle talk about the effects of a government shutdown, I will admit I am pretty sensitive about this. My State of Maryland that I have the honor of representing is home to 286,000 Federal workers—124,000 furloughed today. We have 172,000 Federal workers who work in the State of Maryland. So I am very much aware of what the consequences of this government shutdown have been to our local economy. But let me review where we are, because I am one who wants to get together and get government open as quickly as possible. I hope we can reach agreements and move forward, pay our bills, get rid of sequestration, and get a budget that makes sense. But let me just review how we got to this point, because it has been 6 months since the Senate passed a budget. That is the blueprint for our committees to work.

The House passed a budget, which was different than the Senate budget. Then it was important for both sides to negotiate well before October 1 to get a budget we could agree on so we could pass the appropriations bills. But one party—and one party alone—refused to meet. That was the Republican Party. They refused to meet.

Then we got to October 1. This is not the first time in American history that Congress hasn't been able to pass appropriations bills by October 1. It happens too frequently. But what we do if we can't reach agreement is that we keep government open while we continue at last year's funding level. That is called a continuing resolution. That is what this body did. We passed a continuing resolution so the government would stay open at the funding level the Republicans wanted. We didn't want to get into that fight because of the importance of keeping government open.

Then we had the votes to pass that. We passed it here. We had the votes in the other body. But for one person—the Speaker of the House—not bringing that up for a vote in the House of Representatives where we could have had a bipartisan majority—the government shut down at midnight on September 30.

I know people say it is a Democrat speaking or a Republican speaking. So let me read from the Baltimore Sun today and what they said about the negotiations.

It would be tempting, of course, to write that this impasse—the inability to agree on a continuing resolution to fund government past the end of the fiscal year—was the fault of Democrats and Republicans alike. But that would be like blaming the hostages for causing the perpetrator to put a gun to their heads. As President Barack Obama noted, he and Congressional Democrats put forward no agenda other than keeping the government operating temporarily at current levels.

House Republicans set conditions, not Senate Democrats. It's not even clear how many in the GOP truly wanted this to happen. Conventional wisdom is that a so-called "clean" resolution funding government would have passed on a bipartisan vote if it had been allowed on the floor by House Speaker John Boehner—

The editorial goes on and I continue to quote.

Do House leaders think they can push the blame on President Obama? Some have already tried, but it sounds suspiciously like shoplifters blaming store owners for having so much tempting merchandise lying about. National polls show the public isn't buying it—most Americans didn't want the government to shutter over ObamaCare, and Congressional Republicans have a double-digit lead over the White House when it comes to the public's choice for who most deserves the most blame.

Even the unusual anti-government crowd can't find much comfort in this, as sending federal workers home isn't saving anybody any money. The last time the federal government had an extended shutdown—for 21 days in late 1995 to early 1996—it cost something on the order of \$2 billion. What an extraordinary waste of money, particularly at a time when conservatives claim to be worried about the deficit.

So it is hard to negotiate when one side has put on the table where we should be—allowing government to stay open using last year's numbers—and the other side brings in issues that are totally unrelated to the continuation of government.

Having said that, we have got to find a way to get government open. I am pleased the President is meeting with the leaders this afternoon. I am pleased they are also talking about making sure we pay our bills, which is at jeopardy in just 2 weeks.

I mentioned earlier that I am a little sensitive about this because of the impact it has on the economy of my State. It has an impact on the entire country. In my State, it is \$15 million a day in revenue that we lose directly as a result of the government shutdown. It has been estimated by Moody's Brian Kessler that if the shutdown went 3-4 weeks, it would cost our economy \$55 billion. This is no small impact on our economy. It is a major impact on our economy.

It is not just Federal workers who aren't going to get paychecks. It is the shop owners who depend on business that is going to be cut back. It is contractors who depend on the contracts being honored by the Federal Government, and the list goes on and on of the impact it has on our economy. As I quoted from the Sun paper, it is the taxpayers who will pick up the tab. They are not going to save any money. It is going to cost them money—not a few bucks. It is going to cost a lot of money. And every day we wait, it costs the taxpayers of this country more money. So we are interested in dealing with the deficit and keeping government operating. It is a huge waste of resources to shut down the government.

We are going to lose some vital services. Earlier today I held a conference with Senator MIKULSKI, Senator WARREN, and Senator BOXER where we went over some of the real impacts that occur, and we were joined by Federal workers that wanted to be at work, doing service to this country, but because of the government shutdown they were furloughed.

This is not the first attack against Federal workers we have seen. We have seen freezes on their budgets in the last couple of years. We have seen them furloughed as a result of sequestration. We have seen freezes on hiring so they are asked to do more with less. We have the fewest workers per capita in modern history, asked to do more work. Let me relate some of the stories, some of the accounts by people who came to Washington today so their stories can be told.

Marcelo Del Canto works for the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. He works in Rockville. He lives in Poolesville, MD. He has been a Federal employee for 8 years. He does vital work to help prevent substance abuse. He has work on his desk that he could do today to help

keep people healthier. Instead, he is furloughed, sitting at home—can't go in to work.

We heard from Amy Fritz, a meteorologist and physical oceanographer at the National Weather Service. She works in Silver Spring, MD. I have been there. This is the agency that tracks the storms. Thank goodness we had reliable information about Hurricane Sandy. That work was done not on the weather channel, it was done by Federal public servants. Amy has a double degree. She is a national expert in this area.

Do you know what she said today? "How do I know we should not be tracking a storm right now, getting additional information to keep our country safe?" That is what is at stake. We have seen incredible weather episodes of late. Every person should be on board, doing their work. NOAA had to furlough, same as a layoff, 55 percent of their workforce, 6,633 employees furloughed as a result of the government shutdown.

We heard from Carter Kimsey. She works for the National Science Foundation. She has been there since 1976. She works with young people, getting them involved with science, awarding grants for the basic research that is critically important for economic growth and this country's competitiveness. She tells us she has work on her desk that is critically important to young people continuing in science. She can't work today because of the government shutdown. That is going to affect America's competitiveness. We are going to lose scientists. We are going to lose a great deal as a result of government being shut down.

I heard from Steve Hopkins, Office of Pesticide Programs at the Environmental Protection Agency. EPA had to furlough 94 percent of their workers; 15,181 workers were furloughed at EPA. What is he not doing today that he could have been doing? Helping keep our environment safe from the overuse of pesticides, making it a little bit safer for our children as they breathe the air and drink the water of this country. That is what is at jeopardy here.

I could tell you about their individual stories. When I talked to Marcelo Del Canto, he told me he recently purchased a home in Poolesville, MD. We are happy about that. But he has a mortgage payment. He is married. I asked how is his spouse doing? She is also furloughed. How are they going to make their mortgage payment?

Carter Kimsey was telling us about the ethics they use in scientific experiments. She talked about how they treat the animals they use. She said: You know, we make sure they get the resources necessary. They are fed, they are taken care of. How about our Federal workers? Shouldn't they have their paycheck to pay their food bills?

This is outrageous as far as being wasteful, as far as being against eco-

nomics growth in this country, but it is also wrong. It is wrong to the people who have been victimized by this, who do not know if they are going to get a paycheck. We have people working who do not know if they are going to get paid. We have people who are not working who do not know they are going to get the money to pay their bills. Where is the empathy here for what you are doing? This is outrageous.

My colleagues already talked about the National Institutes of Health located in Maryland; 73 percent of their employees are furloughed. Do you know what they do? Just the most incredible research in the world so we can stay healthy, we can find out the mysteries of incredible diseases. They are working on a vaccine now to deal with influenza to save millions of lives, and what do we do? Tell them to go home and not work? This is not a game. We are affecting people's lives by what we are doing here.

Two hundred patients will be denied care this week at NIH as a result of the shutdown. Who knows for one of those individuals whether it is a question of life or death? That is what is involved.

At the FDA, 45 percent of their employees are furloughed. They will not be able to conduct the inspections for the compliance and enforcement of our food laws, our food safety laws.

At the Department of Interior, 81 percent of their employees are furloughed. What an embarrassment.

I was talking to a reporter from another country.

What an embarrassment, the iconic national parks of America are closed, but it also affects the businesses all around those parks as well as inconveniencing the public.

At the Small Business Administration, two-thirds of their employees are furloughed. Suppose you are a small business person depending on a loan. You do not have the officer there to process that loan. What do you do?

The list goes on and on. I could go through every agency. There is only one answer to this: Keep government—not one agency, two agencies, three agencies—keep every agency open. That is the responsible thing for us to do. We should do that. We should make sure we pay our bills, and yes, we should negotiate a balanced way to move forward with a budget.

I have been talking on the floor many times about that. There is a give and take that we have to make on the budget moving forward. We have to balance our books. We need the revenues necessary to do it. We have to look at all spending, not just discretionary domestic spending. We have to look at all spending. We have to do that in a bipartisan manner because, guess what, the Republicans do not control the House, the Senate, and the White House, and the Democrats do not control the House.

The public expects us to work together on a budget. That is not what this debate is about. This debate is

about whether we are going to keep government open, whether we are going to pay our bills. We must do that for the sake of the people of this country.

I want to mention one other issue. I filed yesterday legislation with many of my colleagues to make it clear that those Federal workers who are furloughed, we are going to fight to do what we did in the 1990s when we went on government shutdown, and pay all Federal workers. They are innocent. They should be made whole. My legislation is cosponsored by many of my colleagues. We have bipartisan support in the House of Representatives. We have to make sure we get that bill passed so every Federal worker is made whole as a result of this shutdown that is not their fault.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that morning business be extended until 5 p.m., and that all provisions under the previous order remain in effect, and that Senator REID be recognized following morning business and that all time spent in quorum calls be equally divided.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I wish to speak as if in morning business and consume as much time as is necessary.

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

Ms. MIKULSKI. Wow, I think we are growing weary. I think we are growing weary of the gridlock, deadlock, and hammer lock on our government. I think we are growing weary of the partisan posturing by one faction in one party in one House. The American people want us to reopen government so that the government can meet the national security needs of the United States, protect the safety of the people of the United States, meet compelling human needs, and do what we can to

create jobs today, such as physical infrastructure, and to lay the groundwork for jobs tomorrow by investing in research and development.

The American people want a government that works as hard as they do, and so do I. Instead of working hard to serve our veterans or our elderly or promoting a growing economy, we are dealing with the shutdown of the government.

The House is sending us bills which on first blush seem attractive. I mean, who doesn't support our National Guard? Who doesn't want to fund NIH? I certainly do. NIH is located in my State. I am so proud of the men and women who work there. Funding also goes to great State universities doing research, such as the University of Wisconsin. They are out there doing it. We cannot cherry-pick. What they are doing now is a public relations ploy.

The House wants to send us cherry-picked solutions to the shutdown problem. It is contrived, and it is cynical. What I am asking the House of Representatives to do is take up the Senate bill we sent them that is a clean continued funding resolution. What does clean mean? It means it is stripped of politically motivated ideological riders.

The second thing is it would fund the government for 6 weeks. In that 6 weeks, it would give us the chance to work out what our funding should be for the rest of the year. I would hope we could find a way to cancel the sequester, which is to reduce public debt without reducing jobs or opportunity, and get us through the debt ceiling. Please—that bill is pending in the House now, and I ask that they do that instead of sending us these piecemeal solutions.

I remind my colleagues that the continuing funding resolution passed the Senate last Friday. It reopens the government, and it gives us the opportunity to renegotiate. I am willing to negotiate, but we can't capitulate to these partisan demands to defund ObamaCare and do other kinds of riders that work against us. To move forward, we need to pass the Senate continuing resolution.

I understand that later today the President is meeting with Speaker BOEHNER, NANCY PELOSI, Majority Leader REID, and Senator MCCONNELL. I hope that wiser heads will now prevail so we can get a path forward to reopen all of government, not just cherry-picked items—many of which are absolutely desirable—and open the entire Federal Government.

I know that the House wants to send something over to reopen NIH. Of course. That's what I just said. But what about the Centers for Disease Control? So we open NIH, but we don't open the Centers for Disease Control. It is an agency that is located in Atlanta, but it is part of our public health triad, which is the work at NIH, the work of the Food and Drug Administration, which stands sentry over the safety of our food supply and the safety and efficacy of our drugs and medical devices,

and then there is the Centers for Disease Control, which is down in Atlanta.

Right this very minute in Atlanta, GA, at the Centers for Disease Control, close to 9,000 people have been furloughed. Furlough is just a nice word that means layoff. It also means that it not only affects the labs in Atlanta, but it also affects labs in Colorado, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia.

The work of the CDC is also nationwide because they are our biosurveillance system on infectious diseases. That means that State health departments—all 50 States and the territories—depend on the Centers for Disease Control to track and give them information on what the trends are related to infectious diseases. They are the ones who alert clinicians and pediatricians if there is a new kind of ear infection that could infect children. But because of the government shutdown, there is no one there who can do this.

Earlier this year—to give an example—Hepatitis A sickened 162 people in 10 States. The CDC linked the outbreak to pomegranate seeds coming in from a foreign country in a frozen berry mix. We were able to go right to the private sector. They complied with us right away, and we were able to get that off the market and contain this so it wouldn't spread to other people. They worked with the private sector in order to protect the American people.

Don't we want to reopen CDC? I could go over disease after disease and infection after infection which will not be monitored. Let's take the common one, flu. We have all had the sniffles, but the sniffles can also kill people. On average more 200,000 Americans will be hospitalized because of flu and 3,000 Americans die from flu. Vaccines can prevent the flu.

The CDC, the Centers for Disease Control, were out there making sure there was enough vaccine available, that it was being distributed fairly and equitably in the United States, but also watching the infection trends because if a trend was heading to one State or one locale, the public health people could work together in order to accelerate or expand our flu vaccine. This is what they do.

Did you also know that there are disease detectives? Many people don't know that there are disease detectives. So what does Senator BARB mean when she says this?

Sometimes there is an outbreak and people get sick. People even die. They wonder what it is. They dial 911, and there is a group of people who are like a disease identification SWAT team. They work with the best and brightest at that State level, use the best technology in science from our country, and even around the world, to identify what that is. That is how we found out about Legionnaires' disease, and the Hantavirus disease which affected Indian reservations. That is how we