

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

described what they claim to be as the piecemeal approach as following my priorities. Several Democrats have used that language publicly. I must note, I find it quite ironic because if I were to stand here and say it is my priority and not the priority of the Democrats to fund veterans, it is my priority and not the priority of the Democrats to fund the National Guard, it is my priority and not the priority of the Democrats to fund our national parks, it is my priority and not the priority of the Democrats to fund research for health care, they would, quite rightly, be able to rise and claim under rule XIX that I was impugning their motives.

I cannot imagine a greater insult than to claim it is not the priority of Members of this body to treat fairly our veterans, and yet what I find so striking is that so many Democrats go out publicly and embrace that. They say: Funding the veterans is CRUZ's priority, not ours.

Yet I will note, even on that front, the funding proposals the House of Representatives has passed are not even the House's priorities—although under the Constitution they have a legitimate role laying out their priorities for funding—they are President Obama's priorities.

Just a few days ago, the President gave a speech to this country, a speech that all of us watched closely, in which the President said if a shutdown occurred “veterans who've sacrificed for their country will find their support centers understaffed.”

The President also said, with regard to parks, as we are discussing now, and memorials: “Tourists will find every one of America's national parks and monuments, from Yosemite to the Smithsonian to the Statue of Liberty immediately closed.”

To the credit of the House of Representatives, they listened to the President's speech, they listened to President Obama's priorities, and the House of Representatives acted with bipartisan cooperation. They said: Mr. President, we have heard your priorities. Let's fund them. Let's work together.

I would note my friend from Maryland a moment ago gave a speech about how important it is, he thinks, that we should fund food inspectors in the Department of Agriculture and also our intelligence community. I would note to my friend from Maryland, I fully agree with him and, indeed, would be happy to work arm in arm and to fund the intelligence community, fully fund them today. The only impediment to that happening is that the Democrats in this body are objecting, and that is what should be abundantly clear.

When it comes to parks, when it comes to memorials, we have all read about World War II veterans being turned away from the World War II Memorial. We have all read about Mount Vernon, which is privately owned—the Federal Government blocking the parking lots.

Mr. REID addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. I ask permission to direct a question through the Chair to my friend from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CRUZ. I am happy to yield for a question from the majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, my question is that I was under the assumption that my friend would offer the consent requests, as we do here with brief responses in the competing consent requests, and then the Senator would speak for 20 minutes. My only concern is this: one, two, three—I have five or six Senators over here wishing to speak. So my question is this: Does the Senator wish to take 20 minutes following this in addition to what time he has taken now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. I thank the majority leader for his question. At his request I began with these unanimous consent requests. It was my intention to give my remarks at the end. But I would note, in each of the objections, my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle have chosen to stand and give their remarks. If remarks are to be given by the Democrats, then it is certainly appropriate that some response be given. So if the courtesy the majority leader was asking was that none of the remarks that his friends and colleagues make have any response, that was not a courtesy I was prepared to give. I was prepared and am prepared to work and cooperate on timing but not to allow only one side of the discussion to be presented.

Mr. REID. Further, Mr. President, I propound a unanimous consent request, and the request is: When the Senator from Texas finishes his consent that he is asking—and there is one more, as I understand it—then I ask permission that the next Senators to be recognized be Senator MIKULSKI for 10 minutes, the Senator from Florida—so it is not bad. Only a couple speakers. So we have Senator MIKULSKI, who will be recognized for up to 15 minutes. I apologize for the interruption. The floor is the Senator's from Texas.

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

The Senator from Texas.

Is there objection to the modification?

Mr. CRUZ. The modification—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the modification of the request of the Senator from Texas by the Senator from New York?

Mr. CRUZ. Reserving the right to object, the modification that the Senator from New York has suggested is that he is unwilling to open our national parks, to open our memorials, unless every other aspect of the government is opened immediately and ObamaCare

is forced upon the American people. That is, quite simply and directly, saying that the Senate will not respond to President Obama's priorities.

President Obama gave a speech to this country saying we should open our parks, we should open our memorials. The House of Representatives said: Mr. President, we, the Republicans, will work with you to do that, and today the Democrats in the Senate are objecting and saying: No, we want every park closed, every memorial closed. All of that will be held hostage until ObamaCare is forced on every American.

I find that highly objectionable, and I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Is there objection to the original request?

Mr. SCHUMER. Reserving the right to object, and I will be brief—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. I just want to make this point: The junior Senator from Texas has said it is President Obama and the Democrats who are shutting the government down. My modification, which he just objected to, would open the entire government. We put it on the floor. We are all for it. He objected to it. Therefore, I object to the proposal of the junior Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Texas.

#### UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST— H.J. RES. 73

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, the fourth unanimous consent request that I would promulgate: I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.J. Res. 73, making continuing appropriations for the National Institutes of Health for fiscal year 2014; I ask further 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?

The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, prior to my responding to my friend, I would use just a few minutes of leader time—I will be very brief—with permission.

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

Mr. REID. Here is what I am going to say.

Mr. President, we have heard this back-and-forth stuff about veterans. But in addition to what the Senator from Washington said, let me read one paragraph from the RECORD of yesterday:

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