

us, Take care of our fellow man and leave no one behind.

So I am going to ask that the Senator modify his request and do what our military has always asked their fellow man to do and leave no one behind. Our request will ensure that everyone who fights for our country, takes care of our country, works for our country in emergencies, depends on our country to make sure they have the opportunity every one of us has here is able to have that opportunity and they are not held hostage to a government shutdown, so we can get back to work and solve our country's problems. We need to end this tea party shutdown and we can do it with the request I will ask right now.

I have a modification to suggest to the request of the junior Senator from Texas. I ask unanimous consent that this request be modified as follows: 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 and it is a clean continuing resolution for the entire government and is something that is already over in the House and reportedly now has the support of the majority of the Members of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas so modify his request?

Mr. CRUZ. Reserving the right to object, I thank my friend from Washington State. I know she talked about leaving no man or woman behind. I would note the continuing resolution the House has passed to fully fund the Veterans' Administration treats our veterans the same way the House and Senate have already treated active-duty military.

Just a few days ago, this body unanimously passed a bill that said the men and women of the military would be paid. Unfortunately, it seems to be the position of the majority in this body that veterans should be treated not as well as our active-duty military and, in particular, that the full funding of the VA should be held hostage to every other priority the Democrats in this Chamber must have.

I understand the Democrats in this Chamber are committed to ObamaCare with all of their hearts, minds, and souls, but the veterans of this Nation should not be held hostage to that commitment. It is likely, given the majority's refusal to negotiate, refusal to compromise, refusal even to talk to find a middle ground—it is likely that this shutdown, instigated by the Democratic majority, will continue for some time, and during that time we ought to be able to find common ground that, at the very minimum, our veterans shouldn't pay the price.

If moments from now my friend from Washington simply does not object, by

the end of the day the VA will be fully funded. If, as we all expect, she does object—if she repeats the objection her majority leader and her party have made throughout the course of this week—then much of the VA will remain shut down because of that objection.

She has asked if we can reopen the entire Federal Government. If the request is not granted to refund every single priority in the Federal Government that the majority party wants, then the VA will remain without sufficient funds.

I find that highly objectionable, and I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Is there objection to the original request?

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I object on behalf of all Americans who should not be left behind.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST— H.R. 3230

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, the second unanimous consent request I will promulgate:

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 3230, making continuing appropriations during a government shutdown to provide pay allowances to members of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces, which was received from the House; I ask further unanimous consent that the measure be read three times and passed, and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the junior Senator from Texas launched this government shutdown with a 21-hour presentation here on the floor of the Senate. It is clear from the actions of the House and his actions today that he is starting to try to reconcile in his mind all the damage which this government shutdown, which he inspired, is causing across the United States.

This particular unanimous consent request relates to National Guard Reservists, a group which we hold in high esteem. But if the junior Senator from Texas is really focused on veterans and those who have served our country, he should take into consideration the 560,000 Federal employees who are currently facing furlough or are on furlough, who are veterans, a fourth of whom are disabled veterans. So what the junior Senator from Texas is doing is picking and choosing who he will allow in the lifeboat. At this moment, it is National Guard and Reserve, while leaving 560,000 veteran Federal employees out in the water thrashing for themselves. That is not the way we should manage or govern this country.

I can understand the anxiety the Senator feels about the problems he has created, but trying to solve them one piece at a time is not the American way. I object. And I ask unanimous consent, though—before I object, I ask unanimous consent that the request be modified, that an amendment which is at the desk be agreed to, that the bill be amended, then be read a third time and passed, and the motion 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, including the National Guard, Reserve, VA, NIH—all of them. It is something that is already over in the House of Representatives and reportedly has the support of a majority of Democrats and Republicans and could pass today.

I ask for that modification.

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

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, no one watching these proceedings should be confused. We are in a shutdown because President Obama and the majority leader of this body want a shutdown, because they believe it is in the partisan interests of their party to have a shutdown.

Four times the House of Representatives has come to us, four times the House of Representatives has endeavored to meet a middle ground, and four times the majority leader and every Democrat in this body has said, No, we will not talk, we will not compromise, we will not have a middle ground, and 100 percent of the priorities of the Democrats in this body must be funded or they will insist on a shutdown.

I thank my friend from Illinois for making clear that the members of the Reserve components of our Armed Forces, in his judgment, are not worthy of being paid during the shutdown that the Democrats have forced. I could not disagree with that judgment more strongly. Let us be clear.

This bill that has passed the House doesn't mention ObamaCare; it has nothing to do with ObamaCare. It simply says the exact same thing my friend from Illinois already agreed to, which is that the active-duty men and women of the military would not be held hostage and would be paid if it so happened that the Democrats forced a shutdown.

Apparently, the position of the majority of this body is that we have a double standard, that Reserve members are not treated as well as active-duty members; that Reserve members will not get their paychecks.

Let's be clear that this bill could be on the President's desk for signature today if my friend from Illinois would simply withdraw his objection. Unfortunately, in a move I think reflects a level of cynicism not befitting of the responsibility all of us have, my friend is prepared to object and to say that

not just veterans but Reserve members shall be held hostage in order to force ObamaCare on the American people; that that is the objective. I guess now the Democratic Party has become the party of ObamaCare, by ObamaCare, and for ObamaCare all of the time, and every other priority recedes. So veterans are told, Your concerns do not matter unless we can use you to force ObamaCare on the American people. Reserve military members are told, Your concerns do not matter unless we can use you as a hostage to force ObamaCare on the American people. That is cynical. We ought to take these individuals off the table.

I note my friend from Illinois spoke of the great many Federal employees who have been furloughed. I would be very happy to work in a bipartisan manner to cooperate with my friend from Illinois to bring a great many of those Federal employees back to their vital responsibilities. But, unfortunately, the position the Democratic Party has taken is that not a one of them will be allowed to come back until this body agrees to force ObamaCare on the American people, despite the jobs lost, despite the people being forced into part-time work, despite the skyrocketing health insurance premiums, and despite the millions of people who are at risk of losing their health insurance.

I find that highly objectionable and I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Is there objection to the original request?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I would say to my colleague from Texas, some of the language which he has used in this debate relative to impugning motives of Members may have crossed the line. I am not going to raise it at this point, but I ask him to be careful in the future.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

For the edification of all Senators, rule XIX reads as follows:

No Senator in debate shall directly or indirectly, by any forms of words, impugn to another Senator or to other Senators any conduct or motive unworthy or unbecoming a Senator.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST— H.J. RES. 70

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I now promulgate my third unanimous consent request.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.J. Res. 70, making continuing appropriations for National Park Service operations, which was received from the House; I further ask unanimous consent that the measure be read three times and passed; and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I will object, but let me say a couple of things here.

First, in reference to the colloquy the Senator from Texas had with my good friend from Washington State, he noted that the Senator from Washington talks about leaving no man or no woman behind. She does, indeed, and that is one of the reasons so many of us oppose this piecemeal approach. It is leaving lots of people behind.

The bottom line is, the junior Senator from Texas is advocating shutting down the government and now he comes before us and says, Well, why don't we pass the parts of the government I want to open? No one would want to do that. It makes no sense: Let's shut down the government and then I will come to the floor and be magnanimous and offer a few places where the government opens.

I note that no other colleagues are standing here on the floor with him. I note that, at least according to press reports, most of the many conservative colleagues in this body reject this approach. And I note that it makes no sense to pick a few—to shut down the government and then pick a few groups to reopen.

Who wants to shut down the government? In my view, it is the tea party. They have said it all along. They have advocated for it.

There are countless instances where even in 2010 tea party folks said: Let's shut down the government. Then it is said, after the government is shut down, that President Obama or this side or the Senator from Illinois caused it, when we had a bipartisan resolution, with a majority on this side? There was an opportunity. I believe the junior Senator from Texas urged his colleagues to vote against that resolution, but 25 of them did not, and that kept the government open in the Senate.

There were many—everyone on this side. The other side of the aisle opposes ObamaCare, but the majority did not want to use a bludgeon and say: Unless you reject ObamaCare we are going to shut down the government or, for that matter, not raise the debt ceiling.

We are not in an "Alice in Wonderland" world, where those who advocate shutting down the government then accuse others of shutting down the government. That is not washing with the American people, and it will not wash in this body with the vast majority of Members on both sides of the aisle.

So I would say to my colleague, if he wishes to have debate on what parts of the government should be funded and at what level, it is wrong, in my opinion, to say: Shut down the government and then we will decide piece by piece which we open. That is "Alice in Wonderland," in my judgment.

It makes much more sense to have the government open and then have the

debate in the proper place—a conference committee that decides future funding, in an omnibus appropriations bill—what level of funding, if any, each part of the government should get.

So to first deprive our national parks of dollars by advocating shutting down the government and then accuse others who do not want to leave 98 percent of the government behind and the people who work there behind and the American people who depend on so many other programs, whether it is student loans or feeding the hungry, is wrong.

So I ask consent that the request be modified as follows: that an amendment, which is at the desk, be agreed to; that the joint resolution, as amended, be read a third time and passed; and that 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 and is a clean continuing resolution for the entire government, actually leaving no man or woman behind, and is something that is already over in the House and has the support reportedly of a majority of the Members of the House, including Members of both parties.

Would the Senator agree to modify his request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator agree to so modify his request?

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I thank the Senator from New York for his heartfelt concern for the Republican Party. I note that the Senator from New York stated that I "have advocated shutting down the government." That statement, unfortunately, is a flatout falsehood, and I know the Senator from New York would not do so knowingly, so it must have been a mistaken statement. Because throughout the course of this debate I have said repeatedly in every context we should not shut down the government, a shutdown is a mistake, and I very much hoped that the majority leader would not force a shutdown on this country. We are in a shutdown because the Democrats in this body have refused to negotiate, refused to compromise.

I would note as well, I am quite grateful for the majority leader's admonition this morning toward civility on the floor and the admonition from the Senator from Illinois toward rule XIX. That is an admonition well heard. Indeed, it was quite striking. It has been several days since I have been to the floor of the Senate, and yet I feel I have been here in absentia because so many Democrats have invoked my name as the root of all evil in the world. Indeed, the same majority leader who gave an ode to civility just a few days ago was describing me and anyone who might agree that we should stop the harms of ObamaCare—describing us as "anarchists." So I think the encouragement toward civility is an encouragement that should be heard across the board.

I would note also that my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle have