

without it; to the Social Security recipients who encounter problems with their check or payment and need someone to guide them or help them receive those checks that they need to survive and now will go without those checks; and resolving veterans' benefits, other kinds of issues all across the country. The chaos and confusion will ripple and accumulate. These effects are cumulative, and they will multiply.

The damage done by these wounds to our workforce are, tragically, self-inflicted and they dramatize how that cumulative effect will, in fact, increase exponentially.

I warned of the effects on job creation and economic growth repeatedly before and after the shutdown occurred. In addition to the vital services that are imperiled and impacted, these economic effects on job creation and recovery are irreparable. They affect people's lives. They are real consequences to real people.

I have called on this body to let compromise and cooler heads prevail and end those ripple effects, end the shutdown, end this self-inflicted wound before it becomes an economic tsunami.

I hope everyone in this body, everyone in this Congress, will use every ounce of their energy, every minute of this day and the days to come to cause this inexcusable shutdown to end, to fix the train wreck before it leads to other wrecks of other trains that may collide.

We have spent a lot of time in this body talking, and it is time we started listening. We ought to be listening to the American people, who are telling us: Get the job done. Get back to work. We ought to be listening to voices of our local communities which are seeing the harm of this shutdown.

Jim Finley, for example, the CEO of the Connecticut Conference of Municipalities, said yesterday:

Our poorest communities. They're the ones who are going to feel the hit first.

That is because the Women, Infants and Children's Program and housing vouchers for low-income families are just two of the programs that make the social safety net work and help people most in need. The WIC Program provides food assistance to more than 58,000 low-income pregnant women, mothers, and children in Connecticut.

Listen to Mayor Pedro Segarra of Hartford, who said:

After 30 days it becomes very difficult. We've already been under pressure from the feds because of sequestration to reduce expenses in several categories.

Recently, Newtown and Monroe, along with other Connecticut communities, received Federal grants to hire local police officers. So listen to Monroe First Selectman Steve Vavrek, who said he has no idea whether that money will ever arrive, and he has no way of checking on it, and, of course, he has no way of planning for future law enforcement in his community.

Students from Sandy Hook Elementary School were relocated to a school

in his town of Monroe. Let's listen to those kids. Let's listen to their parents. They have no one to speak for them here, unless we listen to them.

Similar to children across the country, they need those Federal grants for their schools. If we listen to our local leaders, if we listen to America, we will put the Federal Government back to work. We will avoid that train wreck and tsunami that will result from the spreading ramifications and ripple effects of the loss of income and service that results from this shutdown.

Finally, let me just emphasize one of the very important unintended consequences of actions that we have taken or failed to take. When Congress passed the resolution to pay our troops, we intended to cover all of the men and women who wear the uniform, all who serve in our military forces, including all categories of National Guard service.

Unfortunately, some are not covered in actual practice. I am committed to ensuring that everyone in uniform is paid for their service and sacrifice. Regardless of the numerous diverse categories of service that may exist in the National Guard or in other branches of service, every man and woman who wears the uniform, every man and woman who serves in our military should be paid and paid on time now.

I am committed to making sure our Department of Defense and our government recognizes that obligation. So let's think about them. Let's keep in mind the brave men and women who are serving and sacrificing to keep us free, to make sure our democracy functions in the service of people. Let's keep faith with them as well as with the American people. Let's do our work by making sure we put the American Government back to work and make sure the country is at work. Let the House vote.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

#### UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST— H.J. RES. 72

Mr. LEE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate receives H.J. Res. 72, making continuing appropriations for veterans' benefits for fiscal year 2014, the measure be read three times and passed; that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MURPHY. Reserving the right to object, Madam President, my understanding is that the Senator is proposing to allow for appropriations to move forward for a portion of veterans funding. Let me just say a few things. It is clearly a hardship that the shutdown is going to result in a diminution of benefits to our veterans. I appreciate the Senator coming to the floor to try to address that today.

But as my colleague from Connecticut just mentioned, it is also an

unacceptable hardship that there is about to be 4,000 workers at Sikorsky Aircraft who are going to be furloughed on Friday because of this shutdown. It is also an unacceptable hardship that thousands of Head Start children are going to show up to their preschool being closed. It is an unacceptable hardship to millions of frail elderly who are going to have their nutritional benefits compromised.

So I think we can all agree that the consequences of the shutdown are unacceptable to our veterans. They are unacceptable, though, to a panoply of other families and individuals across the country.

I would note also that I believe the resolution the Senator is offering and suggested be passed provides only partial funding for the VA. There is no funding here to operate the national cemeteries. There is no funding for the Board of Veterans' Appeals. There is no funding for constructing VA hospitals and their clinics. There is no funding, actually, to operate the IT system that the entire VA needs in order to continue going forward.

So I would actually offer and ask unanimous consent that the Senator's request be modified; that an amendment which is at the desk be agreed to, that the joint resolution, as amended, then be read a third time and passed, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

This amendment is the text that passed the Senate. It is a clean continuing resolution for the entire government and something that is already over in the House and reportedly has the majority support of the Members of the House of Representatives. This would solve the problems I am sure the Senator is going to talk about with respect to certain veterans but would also solve all of those other problems and would make sure we continue to have funding for the national cemeteries, continue to build hospitals that need to be built for veterans, continue to service the IT needs that underlay the foundation of our veterans systems, and also make sure Head Start kids do not get turned away from their classrooms, make sure Sikorsky Aircraft workers get to go back to work, make sure our food still gets inspected, we get meals to our frail elderly.

The CR is in front of the Senate. If the Senator would agree, I propose we move forward with this modification to his request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Utah so modify his request?

Mr. LEE. I object to the proposed modification.

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

Mrs. BOXER. Reserving the right to object, I just want to say I so strongly support my colleague from Connecticut. I so oppose what is going on here with the Republicans. Time and time again they have had a chance to

open this government, and they say no. We have the votes in the House. The Senate passed it. We sent it over there. Let's make sure we do what is right for the people. That means opening this government. We show up to work. We have two things to do to earn our pay; one is keep the government open. Just because people are going to get health insurance and it bothers some Republicans, sorry you lost that battle 3½ years ago and then in the election.

So we have to keep the government running, and we have to pay the bills that we all incurred. They are threatening chaos. I am so appreciative the Senator from Connecticut came down and gave another chance to our Republican friends to let them join us and do our job.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MURPHY. Again, the Senator having rejected my offer to modify his consent—we have an opportunity to pass a continuing resolution which enjoys the support of the Senate, which reportedly enjoys the support of the majority of Members of the House of Representatives should the Speaker simply call it. We could solve the problems the Senator is about to talk about, as well as all of the other problems presented to the people being affected today by the shutdown, if we would just move forward with a clean continuing resolution with no political riders attached to it.

For that reason, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, what we are being told by the majority is that we have to vote for everything in order to fund anything. Moments ago, I proposed a unanimous consent request that if approved would provide for the immediate availability of mandatory funds generally controlled through the annual appropriations process for the Department of Veterans Affairs.

I thank the Republican leader for making similar requests earlier today and other Republican colleagues for joining him. I look forward to making other similar requests in the coming hours. Frankly, I am a little stunned at some of the things we are hearing from the other side of the aisle. It is difficult for me to understand the objection to bills the House passed last night and the ones Senate Republicans are trying to pass today.

First, this legislation does not fund anything that is controversial. None of the pieces of legislation being worked on and passed by the House right now and last night can be considered controversial. These bills provide funding for things such as veterans' disability benefits, the GI bill, and cancer research. These bills keep our national parks open and they make sure our National Guard personnel get paid.

There are many things on which Republicans and Democrats do not agree, but whether to take care of our vet-

erans should not be among those things. Second, the President himself has asked Congress to do this. I remind my friends exactly what he said a few days ago, speaking to what might happen during a government shutdown.

He said:

Office buildings would close, paychecks would be delayed. Vital services for seniors and veterans, women and children, businesses and our economy depend on would be hamstrung . . . Veterans who've sacrificed for their country, will find their support centers unstaffed . . . Tourists will find every one of America's national parks and monuments, from Yosemite to the Smithsonian to the Statue of Liberty, immediately closed. And of course the communities and small businesses that rely on these national treasures for their livelihoods will be out of customers and out of luck.

The Republicans in the House of Representatives took the President of the United States at his word and started acting immediately to draft bills that would make sure these priorities received funding. In response, Senate Democrats have said this plan to fund things such as veterans, national parks, and others was fundamentally unserious. They said Republicans were playing games. The biggest head-scratcher of them all, the President issued a veto threat for bills that fund the very things he said he wanted to fund, that he would like Congress to fund.

It makes me wonder, why is it that the President of the United States and the Democrats in the Senate are having such a hard time taking yes for an answer. The fundamental objection, as I understand it, has been that because these bills, passed by the House of Representatives last night, and those being passed today, within the next couple of hours, because those bills do not fund everything, they are objectionable; in other words, we have to fund everything or we may fund nothing.

I have to remind my colleagues that normally, under regular order, Congress will vote on and ultimately approve a dozen or so separate segmented appropriations measures, making sure we address each year within our Federal Government what it is that we are spending money on. This is a big government, one that expends between \$3.5 and \$4 trillion a year. It is appropriate that we break this up into pieces.

But over the last 4½ years or so, we have been operating on the basis of back-to-back continuing resolutions, measures that basically require us to fund everything or fund nothing. So what this proposal does, what the Republicans in the House of Representatives are quite wisely doing is saying let's start with those areas as to which there is the most broad-based bipartisan consensus, and let's keep government funded at current levels, as the continuing resolution would do within those areas, and let's build consensus and let's start funding the government in those areas where there is not significant objection.

What I do not hear from my colleagues is a substantive objection to

what it does fund. What I hear is they are objecting to what it does not fund. So let's pass those things we can agree should be funded, and let's move forward. I think we can get most of this resolved fairly quickly.

Two of the bills in the House of Representatives that have been passed in this fashion have, quite significantly, received substantial bipartisan support. I expect that the rest of them will receive bipartisan support as well. In the middle of an unfortunate government shutdown, surrounded by all of this diverse rhetoric, Republicans and Democrats came together in the House, overwhelmingly, to approve these bills. I think we owe it to the country to show we can do the same in the Senate, acting upon the advice of our better angels and acting in the spirit of bipartisan cooperation to keep our government funded.

Fourth, this is a path forward that was first introduced by none other than the distinguished majority leader himself. On Monday afternoon, Senator HARRY REID from Nevada, the Senate majority leader, asked for unanimous consent to pass a bill that ensured our Active-Duty military would be paid in the event of a shutdown. In a matter of minutes it was done.

So I ask my friends across the aisle: Was Senator REID playing games? Was that unserious? We did that then. Monday, just a few days ago, we passed something that did not fund everything, but it did fund something. It funded the government to the extent necessary to allow us to continue paying our Active-Duty military personnel.

Was that unserious? Well, of course not. Why is it unserious when we try to fund veterans' disability payments, cancer research, or our National Guard?

Why is it all of a sudden trying to play games trying to keep our national parks open?

What exactly has changed since Monday? Why can we come together to pass a bill funding military pay but not to fund veterans' benefits?

Finally, none of these bills has any connection to the implementation of ObamaCare.

I understand that my friends across the aisle support that law despite its numerous failings and indications that it is harming the American people and the economy, that it is hurting jobs and threatening the affordability of health insurance.

I understand that some of my friends across the aisle want to protect that law.

We are going to continue to have that debate about that law, especially in light of all of the problems people are having signing up with the exchanges, not to mention the ongoing problems of job losses, wage reductions, hours lost, and people losing their health coverage because of ObamaCare. Especially in light of all of those problems, we should continue

having that debate, but that debate isn't essential to every aspect of our government's funding.

Let me be clear. We will do everything in our power to protect the American people from the harmful effects of ObamaCare. That fight will most certainly continue.

My friends across the aisle are welcome to join that debate, as I am sure they will. But none of these bills, none of the bills that we are considering today relate in any way to the implementation of ObamaCare.

For this moment, at the very least, we should focus on keeping our promise to the people, those who have sacrificed the most to keep this country free.

I applaud the Republican leadership in the House of Representatives. I applaud the Republicans and the Democrats who have supported legislation to help keep our government funded in these critical areas. We can come together if we act in a step-by-step process, if we pursue a step-by-step process for funding our government.

It more closely resembles the way we should have been appropriating in the first place. This is the best way forward. It is the way to help minimize the pain that Americans are experiencing as a result of this unfortunate shutdown.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAINÉ. Madam President, I rise to talk about the need to reopen government—and not to reopen government in a piecemeal way, one bit this week and then another bit next week, which seems to be the newest gambit on the table. We need to reopen the government because the government of this country should have never shut down in the first place.

Few States are feeling the impact of the shutdown more than Virginia. I wish to tell two stories, a personal one and then a story about one community in my State.

In my State many Federal employees live in Virginia. About 150,000 Federal employees are jeopardized currently by the shutdown, and 70,000 of them are DOD civilians who were already furloughed earlier this year. One of the employees who is jeopardized is a major in the Air Force Reserve by the name of Eric Ryan. He lives in northern Virginia, is married, and has four children.

Eric had a distinguished career in the Air Force, retired, became a civilian, rejoined the Air Force Reserve, and is currently working at the Pentagon. At the Pentagon as a civilian, he is currently furloughed with a wife and four children to support.

Eric is a Presidential Management Fellow and has been loaned to my office for a period of time. He showed up at the Pentagon Tuesday to get furloughed, and then he came to my office to hear me deliver my furlough speech to all of my employees. He got the double dose that day.

This afternoon I have the honor of going and participating in the promotion ceremony for Eric Ryan from major to lieutenant colonel. I am going to talk about him and his qualifications, but it is going to be a bitter moment for all of us as I engage in that promotion for this wonderful person. He first served this Nation by flying dozens of missions in Iraq and Afghanistan and now serves the Nation in a new way, but has now been furloughed twice this year, once because of the sequester and next because of the shutdown. We have tens of thousands of veterans such as Eric Ryan who are going through the furlough experience.

The second is a community story. If you were to ask where in Virginia would you feel the impact of the sequester, I think most people might think the neighborhoods around the Pentagon or Hampton Roads, where there is naval power. But the effects are being felt everywhere.

I wish to speak about one community, Chincoteague, the barrier island off the Eastern Shore of Virginia, the subject of the famous children's book, "Misty of Chincoteague." It is beautiful community, a tiny small town.

Chincoteague's economy is fundamentally about visits to the national seashore, Assateague and Chincoteague Islands. But those parks and national resources have been closed.

I got a call Tuesday morning right away from friends in Chincoteague saying: Chincoteague is motels, restaurants, grocery stores, gas stations, and people who sell suntan lotion and sunglasses. Because of the closure, the entire economy has had its guts pulled out during the Federal shutdown.

Moreover, there is a historic lighthouse at the wildlife refuge that has been restored. It has taken 6 years to restore. This week was the opening and celebration of the lighthouse. They expected visitors to come from everywhere. That has been cancelled.

Chincoteague has one other industry that is very important. They didn't only want to be about tourism, so over the last 15 to 20 years they have worked to build up the capacity of NASA at Wallops Island, which is 5 miles from Chincoteague Island.

Kids who graduate from high school and are interested in science and math don't have to move away and never come home. They can get a science and math degree, come back, and work as rocket scientists. Eighty percent of the NASA employees at Wallops near Chincoteague have been furloughed as a result of this shutdown.

The experience of Col. Eric Ryan, who works in my office, and the experience of this small community on the Eastern Shore of Virginia demonstrates how serious these effects are.

The good news is we can solve this if Speaker BOEHNER would only allow a vote to reopen government.

The Presiding Officer knows this because we sat through it together. It bears a little bit of repetition.

The Senate passed a budget on March 23 that funds all of these issues at the level that the Senate thinks is right. The same week the House passed a budget funding government at levels they think is right.

Under the Budget Control Act of 1974, the right strategy at that point was to put the two budgets in conference and let conferees figure it out. For folks who aren't familiar with it—and there may be some who are listening—a budget conference is a pretty simple thing.

When I was Governor of Virginia, we had them all the time. The two Houses would pass different budgets. Each House takes their budget, goes into the negotiating room, sits down, and compares. One side wins on this issue, one side wins on the other, and on a third issue they might split it 50-50. The House budget and the Senate budget are very different.

But that is what we do. We sit down, listen, dialogue, compromise, and we solve the problems of the country. Nineteen times since March 23 we have stood on the floor of this body and said we want to go to conference with the House on this budget. Nineteen times, the last of which was yesterday, a small handful of Senators—and that was the phrase that the Senator from Utah used once on the floor in blocking this: We are a small handful of Senators—and the House Republicans have blocked a budget compromise.

For the last 6½ months we have not had the opportunity to sit down and dialogue. For folks who don't know how a budget conference works, if, in a conference a compromise is reached, it doesn't just become law like that. The compromise has to come back to both Houses. Both Houses debate the compromise, both Houses vote on the compromise, and everyone's interests are protected. They can look at the compromise and decide whether they like it or don't.

For 6½ months we have been blocked in an effort to go to budget conference. Imagine our amazement. In this body on Monday night, after the House shut down government, 3 hours later they passed a bill and said: We have an idea. Let's have a conference. Finally, 6½ months after they shut down government. But let's have it be a really particular kind of conference, not a conference about the budget of the United States. Let's have a conference about whether the Government of the United States should be open or closed.

I know I can speak for my colleagues who are here. Our view is we will negotiate, compromise, and listen to any policy issue. Budget negotiation is exactly how you do this or policy debates are how you do it. But what none of us in this body or in the House should ever negotiate is whether the United States exists or not, whether it is funded or not, whether it is open or closed.

I believe it has to be open. That is essentially what our oath of office says we have to do when we say we will

faithfully discharge all the duties of the office to which we have been elected.

We also won't negotiate whether the United States should pay its bills because the 14th Amendment to the Constitution in Section 5 makes very plain that the public debt of the United States and its validity shall not be questioned.

There is a way forward here, and it is such a simple way forward: that is, Speaker BOEHNER needs to allow a vote in the House. It is simple. Allow a vote and not only allow a vote, but allow a vote on a budget number that he has already agreed to.

The continuing resolution the Senator from Connecticut talked about that is currently pending, funds government for an interim period of time at a budget level that was the House's number. It is not a number I liked. We had a different number in the Senate, a higher number we want to fund it to. But we accepted the House's number for the short-term spending bill out of a spirit of compromise.

We sent it back to the House and we said: We are compromising. We are not even going 50–50. We are compromising by accepting your budget number. This is not as if the Senator from Utah said we want to fund everything or nothing, no. We have other things we would like to fund that we are not funding in this bill because we accepted everything the House wants to fund in their CR.

They only need to accept yes for an answer. The good news is this is not a partisan issue because many Senate Republicans want to do exactly what I am suggesting.

Based on current reports in the House, there are numerous House Republicans—four of whom are from Virginia—who are publicly on the record. They wish to do exactly as we are suggesting.

Speaker BOEHNER, bring your own spending bill up for a vote. If you do it will pass. If it passes, government will reopen. Once government has reopened, we can have a budget conference and talk about any issue the House wants to talk about, any issue that we want to talk about. But it is time to end hostage politics and reopen the doors.

The Speaker has it in his hands to do that, simply and immediately.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. TESTER. Madam President, people all around this country—and Montana is no exception—are looking at the actions in Washington, DC, and they are shaking their heads in disbelief. They are shaking their heads in disbelief because the government has shut down, but yet a bill has passed the Senate. If the Speaker of the House would offer it on the House floor, it would pass the House and the government wouldn't have to be shut down.

Then all the resolutions put forth on the other side, and some on this side, quite frankly, about opening different

areas of the government, would all be settled because government would be open.

A previous speaker this morning said: We shouldn't be dealing with overall government. We should be dealing with this in piecemeal fashion.

Really? Who determines who gets help and who determines who doesn't? The fact is the government provides some pretty essential services to folks across the board. To stand on this floor and cherry-pick certain pieces of the government to fund and not to fund is totally unfair. Quite frankly, those groups know they are being used as political pawns in this process.

We started out these negotiations with a CR that was at \$1.58 trillion. We compromised that down to a point of \$986 billion, somewhere around a \$70 billion reduction. This is real money, a significant compromise.

The House came back and said: No, that is really not good enough. We want that \$986 billion figure, and then we also want to defund the Affordable Care Act.

Why? Because, my goodness, it is the most terrible thing. There are all sorts of reasons given on the floor why the Affordable Care Act is so terrible.

For example, I had a flat tire on my truck last week—it was the Affordable Care Act. I ran out of fuel in my fuel tank—that doggone Affordable Care Act.

Let's get the Affordable Care Act implemented and all of these bogus excuses about why it is so bad will go away. People will get the advantage of affordable insurance once again, not government health care, but affordable insurance so they can afford to get sick.

Aside from that, the repeal of it was turned back. Then they came back with a delay of 1 year and said: Oh, by the way, if you work for Congress or you are a Member of Congress, we are going to take away any sort of insurance benefits you get whatsoever.

This was interesting. Because, quite frankly, if Members of Congress don't want that benefit, they will turn it back, and I anticipate some will after the Affordable Care Act is put into place. I doubt that very much.

Instead, what happened was we turned that back, and now we are in a situation where we sent back a clean continuing resolution at \$986 billion. In the House, if the Speaker would put that bill on the floor, it would pass and we could start doing the business of this country once again rather than sitting here in a government shutdown where things aren't working and we are not addressing the issues that need to be addressed.

But when we take a look at whether we are going to fund certain programs, I want to talk about a few very briefly before I kick it over to the Senator from Colorado.

We have intelligence folks who are not on the ground, but we have folks fighting in theater right now who need

that intelligence. Whether they get it is up in the air. The folks who protect our clean water and air are off the job. Clean water is our most important resource, and they are not there to make sure it remains clean. Kids on Head Start, food inspectors, research into energy so we can have a 21st-century economy and affordable energy in that 21st century—they are all off the job. Domestic violence and folks who are impacted by domestic violence—there are shelters that are determining right now whether they will turn away those victims of domestic violence.

The list goes on and on and on. Whether we are talking about the Centers for Disease Control or we are talking about logging and salvage sales or talking about allowing wells to be drilled in the Bakken—that has all stopped. Why? Because of a Speaker of the House—who, by the way, a previous speaker just said they were very proud of. But why has it stopped? It is because of a Speaker of the House who doesn't have the internal guts to put this on the floor and let it pass the House of Representatives. That would put this country back to work so we could start doing the things we need to do in the halls of the Senate and the halls of the House that are important for this country, whether it is the farm bill or housing reform or a defense authorization bill—the list goes on and on. Instead, we are dealing with a totally self-inflicted crisis supported by people who want to shut this government down. Regardless of what they say on this floor, they are very happy because this government is shut down.

It is time, Members of the House of Representatives, that you demand that the Speaker put that bill up so you can vote on it and we can get back to doing the business of this country.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BENNET. Madam President, I would like to first say how much I appreciate the words of the Senator from Virginia and the words of the Senator from Montana. They are known to be commonsense people, to work in a bipartisan way day after day in this Congress, against all odds, to actually try to make something work around this place. So I thank them for their leadership and their comments this morning.

For 4 years I have come to this floor at about this time of the year and talked about how Washington has become the land of flickering lights where the standard of success is not how we are imagining the future and what we are doing for the next generation of Americans but that we are managing, after a little bit of aggravation and hostility, to keep the lights on for 1 more month or for 6 more months. Well, this time we are not the land of flickering lights. The lights are out in Washington. They have managed to shut down the government.

No mayor, no school superintendent, no city council in Colorado would

threaten the shutdown of their government over politics. Whether they are a Democratic mayor or a Republican mayor or a tea party mayor, we wouldn't stand for it in Colorado. They certainly would never threaten the credit rating of their community over politics. In fact, it is exactly the opposite. We just had these terrible floods in our State, and people are struggling to do everything they can to keep their governments open to provide people who have been displaced by the flood, who have lost everything they own, the services they need.

This shutdown is already hurting the U.S. economy and Colorado's economy, and it is not surprising why. There is a lot of rhetoric around this place about uncertainty and the damage it does to our economy. Nothing could create more uncertainty than shutting this government down and threatening the credit rating of the United States by saying: We are not going to pay our bills. We have an ideology that is so far outside the mainstream of American political thought that we can't find a way to actually win elections that align with our ideology, so we are going to use these kinds of tactics to bring this government to its knees.

The AP reported that the U.S. and European stock markets fell yesterday as investors and world leaders worried about the threat to the global economy. According to the Denver Post, the shutdown may cost the United States at least \$300 million a day in lost output during a 1-week shutdown. What good is that doing anybody? How is that helping any American? Economists have estimated that a 3-week closing would cut economic production by 1 percent. It would cut our GDP by 1 percent. How does this self-inflicted wound help anybody?

In Colorado, to be clear, just as in the other States we have heard about today, it is not just the families who rely on Federal programs or Federal workers who are suffering because of this shutdown. The Denver Post reported that in a neighborhood near the Denver Federal Center, Rick Koerner, who owns Stack Subs sandwich shop in Lakewood, estimates he has lost about 5 percent of his normal business since the shutdown began on Thursday. He says he can't afford to lose any customers because, in his words, "it's a thin-margin business to begin with." How are we helping him? In the same story, Deborah Giovingo, who owns a restaurant called Paradise Cove on West Alameda Avenue, just east of the Federal Center, said she is also witnessing a loss. "We're not getting our regular lunchers. I think they're really trying to conserve their money." Right now, how are we helping these people?

One city perhaps hardest hit in our State is Colorado Springs in El Paso County. According to the Colorado Springs Gazette, the furloughs at our military bases include more than 1,000 workers at the Air Force Academy, 400 workers at Schriever Air Force Base,

2,200 at Peterson Air Force Base, and 700 at U.S. Northern Command. At Fort Carson another 1,000 workers are off the job. Is our job more important than their job? Is the job they do to protect this country, to defend this country, less important than the job of these elected representatives in Washington who are still taking a salary? I don't think so. Are these jobs less important than the people who are actually in theater right now in Afghanistan? I don't think so.

After 1 week of shutdown, the WIC Program—the Women, Infants, and Children Program—will have no funds for clinical services, food benefits, and administrative costs. Roughly 100,000 women and children in Colorado participated in the WIC Program last year and will lose their benefits.

The shutdown will delay SBA loans for Colorado's small businesses. Last year SBA processed 1,300 applications, for a total of \$559 million in loans, and they are on the ground right now, thank goodness, working with people who have suffered through these floods.

Our national parks, wildlife refuges, and recreational lands—major drivers of Colorado's economy—are closed. They are shut down. Approximately 13,000 people visiting national parks in Colorado will be turned away each day this government is closed. It will result in nearly \$800,000 of revenue a day for our local communities, which are already suffering because of the floods. Estes Park is one of the towns that have been terribly affected, and this is one of their peak times of the year for tourism because of the changing leaves. They are losing that opportunity, and we are making it worse because the government is shut down.

Thousands of Federal employees are out of work during this economic recovery. There is a delay in Social Security services. There will be a delay in veterans' benefits by the end of October. Colorado is home to almost 400,000 veterans. That is almost 10 percent of our State's population.

At risk is the funding for Head Start agencies and the Export-Import Bank's support for small companies.

But what is just so insulting at this moment is that we are trying to recover from this flood. The recent flooding damaged at least 17,000 homes and other structures, several thousand of which were outright destroyed. Millions of dollars' worth of public infrastructure has literally been swept away. More than 200 miles of Colorado roads and at least 50 bridges have been damaged or destroyed. Nine Coloradans lost their lives in the floods. The floods consumed an area of Colorado that is twice the size of Rhode Island. The devastation defies belief. Houses have been leveled and reduced to piles of debris, and some of these communities lie in ruins.

FEMA has pledged to go to great lengths, and they are working very hard to ensure that crucial disaster response and recovery services are not

interrupted. To be clear, so far, emergency funds are still flowing and emergency workers are still in place. They are doing a phenomenal job, and I want to say on this floor, on behalf of everybody in Colorado, how grateful we are for their work. FEMA is going to make sure this work gets done, but nevertheless a number of FEMA employees—both based in Washington and at the FEMA Region VIII office headquartered in Denver—are vulnerable to furloughs if this shutdown continues.

Our economy is recovering in Colorado, and we are being led by innovative businesses that have been growing jobs despite the dysfunction in Washington. This year I visited many of them—companies that, in the depths of the worst recession since the Great Depression, were actually creating jobs by inventing our future. That is what innovators do, and that is what Coloradans do. We are letting them down profoundly here by failing to exercise our most basic responsibilities as legislators, as people who receive a salary from the taxpayer. They do not send us here to shut it down, they send us here to improve it. They send us here to come to agreement and to compromise and to imagine a better future for our children and for our grandchildren. That is what we are here to do.

Instead, a very radical faction in the House and some of their colleagues here in the Senate have shut this government down in support of an ideology that, as I mentioned earlier, is far outside the mainstream of American political thought. They are entitled to their opinion. Everybody is entitled to their opinion. But they are not entitled to shut the government down if they don't get what they want, and that is where we find ourselves.

It has been a privilege for me to work in this place, and the moments I have enjoyed the most have been the ones where we have worked in a bipartisan way, with colleagues on the other side, to dramatically improve the way the Food and Drug Administration works so that new drugs could be approved more quickly and so that the 600 biotech firms in Colorado that came to me and said they could no longer raise venture capital because it was all going to Europe and Asia because of uncertainty with the FDA and to please help them fix that—with Republican colleagues, we were able to get that done.

In working the immigration bill we passed, with the Gang of 8—four Democrats and four Republicans—we solved each other's political problems to bring a product to the floor that actually could pass with nearly 70 votes—a supermajority of the Senate—and we still need to pass that bill in the House.

That bill, in stark contrast to the government shutdown we are going through right now, actually will drive GDP growth. The Congressional Budget Office tells us that immigration bill adds 3 points of GDP growth in the first 10 years and 5 points in the second 10 years.

By the way, at a moment when these people are saying they are shutting the government down, mostly because of the health care bill but also because of their concern about a growing government and widening deficits, the immigration bill reduces the deficit by \$900 billion over a 20-year period. That is real money even in Washington, DC. They could be passing that bill over there. Instead, the government is shut down, and it has been a catastrophic failure of leadership that has brought us to this place.

I have absolutely no doubt, from all the press reports I have read and what I hear from my Republican colleagues in the Senate, my friends in the Senate who are Republicans, that if Speaker BOEHNER put on the floor of the House the Senate version of the so-called continuing resolution, it would pass with a broad majority of Democrats and Republicans, and the American people would cheer because that is what they want. They want us working together. And the standard of success needs to be something greater than that we kept the lights on, which in this instance we haven't. We haven't even done that. What is the signal we are trying to send to this complicated world in which we live by shutting this government down? Why is it that people here get away with things that no local elected official would ever get away with?

So we have to continue to fight to get this government open. We are going to have another fight to make sure that, for the first time in the United States, we don't fail to pay our bills and blow up the full faith and credit of the United States—which is one of our most important assets, right up there with the rule of law, right up there with our capitalist economy. From our founding, the full faith and credit of the United States has been a bulwark for us.

But once we get past that, what we need to fight for is the next generation of Americans. That is why we have been sent here. Whether we are Democrats or Republicans, that is why we are here. And they are waiting to see whether we are willing to be the first generation of American leadership to provide less opportunity—not more—to the people that are coming after us.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENRICH). The Senator from Connecticut.

#### EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the period of morning business for debate only be extended to 5 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

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

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

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, the Founding Fathers set up a system of government which intentionally made social change in this country hard to achieve. They set up a pretty complicated legislative process with an innovative bicameral legislature in which you have to get the exact same bill with the exact same text passed through two different Chambers. They set up courts that could overturn those laws if they didn't abide by the Constitution. They set up an office down the street in the White House with a veto power that could cancel out actions of the majoritarian legislature. Then they built in pretty frequent elections so that if people didn't like what happened here, they could change the composition of the legislature to try to get something different to happen. So I imagine that is why it took 100 years since Teddy Roosevelt first proposed that this country make a commitment to universal health care that we actually got here. All the while, we watched as every other industrialized nation in the world decided that the compassionate thing to do was to make sure people didn't die because they didn't have enough money to get into the health care system, and they committed themselves to universal health care while the United States sat on the sideline.

What happened is a couple years ago when, after 100 years of debate and consternation and gridlock, we finally made a decision as a nation to move forward with a health care reform bill that finally puts us on the road to guaranteeing that everybody in this country at least gets some basic access to health care, no matter how much money you have in your wallet or pocketbook. What happened is the system was literally crashing down around us. We finally woke up to the reality that we were paying twice as much for health care as any other country in the world and getting so much less—not only in that there were tens of millions of people who were sitting on the sidelines, but also in that the outcomes we were getting weren't good enough for the amount of money we were paying.

Finally the American public sent Members of the House of Representatives to make a change. They elected Senators determined to make a change. They elected a President who campaigned on making a change. So in 2010, we overcame the barriers that had been set up by the Founding Fathers to major social change. Both Congresses passed that health care law. Two years later, it was upheld by the Supreme Court as constitutional. Later that

year, in 2012, President Obama ran on his support of the law and his promise to implement it and was elected by a wide margin. I would note, every single Senator here who voted for it and stood for election got returned to the Senate.

But despite all of this—despite the fact that after 100 years of debate, the democratic process produced a health care reform bill that expands coverage to millions of Americans and lowers the cost of insurance for them, despite the fact that it withstood all of the challenges that can come to a major reform like that—including a constitutional challenge, including the question being put to the electorate again after the law was passed in 2010 and 2012—despite all that, Republicans have been coming to the floor of the Senate and the floor of the House saying we have got to shut down the government because the people don't want this health care law to be implemented.

And that is why they are doing this right now—because they know this is their last chance to try to get this law repealed. This law, which has already saved millions of seniors money, which right now as we speak is saving families thousands of dollars as they sign up for these exchanges, they know this is their last chance to get this bill repealed because it is about to go into effect, and all of their ridiculous arguments about how the sky is going to fall once this reform is implemented will be proven untrue. So Republicans come down here and say the American public wants this delayed.

First, let me make the point that my colleagues have been making all day: This is not the place to have that conversation. The people of this country do not support the government being shut down over Republicans' objection to the healthcare bill. There is no way this place can work if every single person adopts a "my way or the highway" approach, if it is a condition of running the government for just 6 weeks—which is essentially what we are arguing over here—that we have to get everybody's particular political points solved.

I get it the Republicans don't like the health care bill. But I come from Newtown, CT. I don't understand why we can't agree that before you buy a weapon, everybody should get a simple criminal background check. That is as important as anything in the world to me, coming from where I do. But I am not conditioning my support for the operation of the Federal Government upon Republicans agreeing to support me on background checks. And I bet I feel just as strongly about background checks, coming from a State which witnessed that kind of slaughter, as any Republican believes in the repeal of the health care law. But that is not how I am going to operate, nor is it how any other Democrat is operating.

When I listen to people say, well, neither side is willing to negotiate, we don't have anything to negotiate over,