

pointing out that very important fiscal decisions, very important debt-related decisions have absolutely been made in our Nation's history, and I am glad they have been made in connection with this debate on the national debt.

I yield back to my friend from Ohio and thank him for allowing me to intrude on his time.

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, if the Senator will hold for a moment, first, I thank the Senator for referring to the op-ed in the Wall Street Journal. I have not seen it yet so I look forward to reading it myself. It sounds as though it is consistent with what I was pointing out, which is it would only make sense that the American people would want us to reduce spending when we extend the debt limit yet again—again, at historic levels now. The American people get it. They know we can't keep spending more than we take in, so they expect us to do something about the underlying problem.

Mr. WICKER. Madam President, the Senator from Ohio mentioned the Budget Control Act of 2011. It wasn't a particularly pretty way to do debt reduction, but it did give us the spending levels we are operating under now.

The authors of this opinion piece go on to point out that according to the Congressional Research Service—an independent arm of this government—Congress voted 53 times from 1978 to 2013 to change the debt ceiling. The debt ceiling has increased to about \$16 trillion. In at least 53 votes, 29 occurred in a Congress run by Democrats, 17 in split Congresses, and 7 in Republican-controlled Congresses. It goes on to point out time and again how important policy changes were made in connection with this debate.

So I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I wish to ask my friend from Mississippi a question. He has been stalwart on budget debates and he is a guy who has always held the line, in the House and in the Senate. He voted for the Budget Control Act because he believes we need to get our spending under control. He also wants to ensure that we deal with the part of the budget that is not being talked about because the whole continuing resolution debate is about 35 percent of the budget. The other 65 percent, which is the faster growing part, based on the Congressional Budget Office, parts of that—the health care entitlements—will grow over 100 percent over the next 10 years. I ask the Senator from Mississippi if he is hearing back home what I am hearing from my constituents, which is they want us to do something on the spending before we extend the credit card limit again.

I wonder if he could tell us what he is hearing back home, given his background.

Mr. WICKER. The distinguished Senator from Ohio is absolutely correct. As a matter of fact, the American people are alarmed, actually, at the level of debt this government has run up, particularly in the last 4½ to 5 years.

It has been astounding. We cannot continue to add debt upon debt for the next generation, many of whom are within the sound of our voices and some of whom are employed as our pages. The Senator has already referred to them today. We owe them a government that grows our debt at a much slower rate.

We have done it before. When the distinguished Senator and I were in the House of Representatives, we were told we could not balance the budget within 10 years. Actually, with the leadership of my friend from Ohio, we passed legislation. We had the cooperation of the President of the United States who negotiated with us, and that divided government balanced the budget not within 10 years but within 3 or 4 years, and we fulfilled that until the terrorist attacks of 2001.

So, yes, the American people are concerned. I think we would be doing a disservice to them, simply to go along with a debt increase without addressing the underlying problems. As my friend from Ohio knows, the President of the United States himself in this budget has proposed very significant changes in the growth rate of certain of our entitlement programs, which would go a long way toward getting us to a bipartisan resolution on this issue.

Mr. PORTMAN. The Senator raises an important point, which is that the larger part of the budget—the 65 percent of the budget that is not being debated as part of a continuing resolution, not subject to congressional appropriations and the faster growing part of the budget—is an issue the President actually did address in his own budget. In fact, he laid out a number of proposals called mandatory spending reforms that would help to reduce some of the debt by reducing some of the cost increases on that 65 percent of the budget.

By the way, 65 percent today, 10 years from now will be 76 percent of the budget. The departments and agencies that are appropriated every year are only 35 percent, soon to be reduced to 24 percent of the budget. So that is a very good point the Senator makes.

The President himself has pointed out that we need to make changes. Yet he refuses to negotiate, refuses to talk, refuses to consider any of these proposals. It doesn't seem to make sense, and it is certainly not in the interests of the American people, the people from Mississippi and the people from Ohio.

I thank my colleague from Mississippi for joining me. I look forward to reading the new material he has provided for the RECORD today. I thank him for his leadership.

I yield the floor and note 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 Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. 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. GRASSLEY. Madam President, as my colleagues have done on several occasions, I come to the floor also to speak on the shutdown and the pending effort to find a compromise we can finally get to the President of the United States. Today, specifically, I come to the floor to take issue with a remark made by the President on Tuesday this week regarding the health care reform bill that he also sometimes calls ObamaCare. He said:

The Affordable Care Act is a law that passed the House, that passed the Senate, the Supreme Court ruled constitutional. It was a central issue in last year's election. It is settled, and it is here to stay.

While I understand the President's position on the law that now is referred to by his name, he also misses the point. On Monday night, the Senate had the opportunity to keep the government running. The Senate had a bill that funded the government and did so without delaying or defunding ObamaCare. As we all know, the Senate voted down that bill. So let me repeat: The government could have been kept open without delaying or defunding ObamaCare. Anyone who says anything different is simply not being accurate.

What did the bill Monday night seek to do? The bill sought to delay the implementation of the individual mandate for 1 year and require executive branch appointees to go to the exchanges. Those are changes to ObamaCare.

Apparently, the President doesn't believe we are allowed to make any changes whatsoever to ObamaCare. I would respect that position if the President actually enforced it over the last several years, as he had bills presented to him that he signed and that actually made some changes in the health care reform law. In fact, Congress has made numerous changes to ObamaCare since it was signed into law. I have a list here, but it is a list I will read in its entirety so people know the President has accepted changes to his prime piece of legislation and so I can refute that the President isn't consistent when I go back now to his quotation when he says:

The Affordable Care Act is a law that passed the House, that passed the Senate, the Supreme Court ruled constitutional. It was a central issue in last year's election. It is settled, and it is here to stay.

By that, I think the President is signifying that we can't do anything to touch the issue whatsoever, even to the minimal extent that we tried to Monday night.

So this list was conveniently assembled not by this Senator but by the Congressional Research Service, and it was done on behalf of Senator COBURN.

In the 111th Congress, to start with the first change we made that the President accepted, H.R. 4887 clarified that health care provided under TRICARE, TRICARE for Life, and the Nonappropriated Fund Health Benefits Program constitutes “minimal essential health care coverage.”

Then we had H.R. 5014, clarifying that the health care provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs constitutes, according to the health care reform bill, “minimal essential health care coverage.”

H.R. 1586 modified the definition of average manufacturer price to include inhalation, infusion, implanted or injectable drugs that are not generally dispensed through a retail community pharmacy.

H.R. 4994 offset the costs of the Medicare and Medicaid Program extensions and the postponement of cuts in Medicare physician payments with a change in the Affordable Care Act, but the President signed it.

H.R. 4853 extended the nonrefundable adoption tax credit through tax year 2012.

H.R. 6523 extended TRICARE coverage to dependent adult children up to age 26, to conform with the private health insurance requirements under the Affordable Care Act. The President signed that.

In the 112th Congress, H.R. 4 repealed the requirement that businesses file an information report whenever they pay a vendor more than \$600 for goods in a single year.

H.R. 674 modified the calculation of modified adjusted gross income to include Social Security benefits.

H.R. 3630 reduced the Prevention and Public Health Fund annual appropriations over the period from fiscal year 2013 to fiscal year 2021 by a total of \$6.25 billion to help offset the cost of extending the payroll tax cut. That is a monumental change in the bill. The President signed that.

H.R. 4348 modified the Medicaid disaster-recovery FMAP adjustment by changing the adjustment factor and the effective date.

H.R. 8 transferred 10 percent of the remaining unobligated Consumer Operated and Oriented Plan—and we call that the CO-OP—program funds to a new CO-OP contingency fund and rescinded the other 90 percent of those funds and repealed the CLASS Act.

H.R. 1473 was another bill that the President signed. It canceled \$2.2 billion of the \$6 billion appropriation for the CO-OP program.

H.R. 2055 rescinded \$400 million of the remaining \$3.8 billion for the CO-OP program, rescinded \$10 million of the \$15 million fiscal year 2012 appropriations for the Independent Payment Advisory Board, instructed the Secretary of Health and Human Services to establish a Web site with detailed information on the allocation of moneys in the Prevention and Public Health Fund, and prohibited use of those funds for lobbying, publicity or propaganda pur-

poses. That bill was signed by the President.

H.R. 933 rescinded \$200 million of the \$500 million transfer from the Medicare Part A and Part B trust funds for the 5-year Community-Based Care Transition Program and rescinded \$10 million of the Independent Payment Advisory Board’s fiscal year 2013 appropriation.

These are changes made by Congress to the law the President refers to as settled law. When he talks about settled law, he talks to us that the Affordable Care Act cannot be changed now as we are debating things with a continuing resolution. Obviously, the act is not so settled that Congress cannot and has not amended it in the last several years.

But as we all know, the President, through his own actions, has, in addition, considered ObamaCare not to be settled law either. The President has, through administrative action himself, made numerous changes to ObamaCare.

In February, the President delayed application of the out-of-pocket limits. In March, the President delayed implementation of the Basic Health Plan Option. Also, in March, the President delayed a requirement that small business exchanges offer a choice of plans. In July, the President delayed the exchange applicant eligibility and verification. In July, in perhaps the most famous example, the President delayed implementation of the employer mandate. In regard to that, there were even Members of the President’s party in the Senate—that said the President did not have the legal authority to do that.

So on Monday night, House Republicans sent the Senate a bill that did not defund or delay ObamaCare. It continued funding our government. It simply sought to amend ObamaCare in the same way—dozens of times—as I have just illustrated it has been amended. There was not even any debate of the proposals on their merits. It was simply handled in the most simple way you can here, tabled by the Democratic leadership. Now we hear about the farcical issue of settled law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator’s time is expired.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, could I have 2 more minutes, please.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I do not know where this settled law legal theory comes from. I would note that some of my colleagues have ignored this theory during previous health care debates.

In 2003, Congress passed a law, a bipartisan law, called the Medicare Modernization Act. This law passed with Members of both parties supporting it. It was signed into law by the President. It survived any court challenges that were made against it. It was, by the same token, settled law. That did not stop my colleagues from proposing legislation to amend Part D, called the Medicare Modernization Act. In fact, Democrats, including Members still

currently in the Senate, proposed and voted to alter the Medicare Modernization Act by striking the noninterference clause. We considered that proposal and debated it on its merits, as we should have the amendments to the Affordable Care Act recently offered. We did not dismiss it as offensive because it sought to amend a settled law.

The government could be open and fully operating today but for the Democrats’ unwillingness to engage in legitimate debate over the proposals to amend ObamaCare, not defund it or delay it.

We are where we are because the majority refuses to give the American people relief from the individual mandate and treat President Obama and his political appointees the same as all other Americans are by going to the exchange.

In the wash of words that we will hear on the floor, I hope this simple truth can be heard.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Madam President, recently there was a disturbing poll in the Washington Post. It said that most Americans fear that the American dream is passing them by. Almost 65 percent worry that they cannot make ends meet with their current incomes. That is up from 48 percent in 1971.

We are not talking about luxuries—just basic living expenses: food and clothing for their kids, a roof over their family’s head, just getting by day-to-day. So many of our fellow citizens are working harder than ever and still feel as though they are falling behind. They wonder: Where is the country headed?

This week, they are wondering more than ever, watching the spectacle here in Washington, watching the government shut down, grinding to a halt. I am hearing from my constituents, from people in New Mexico, and they are frustrated and worried. They are concerned about the U.S. Department of Agriculture crop payments, as we head into the harvest, when they need financing the most. They are concerned about being able to close on mortgages with Federal backing, with their loans on hold.

Many New Mexicans are going to be furloughed without pay. This hurts their families and all the businesses that rely on them in our economy—restaurants, retailers, car washes, landscapers, any type of business one can imagine.

This shutdown did not have to happen. We are not debating the amount of the budget. The fact is, House Republicans are demanding concessions just for keeping the lights on at the Federal Government.

I think most Americans have two questions. How did we get into this mess and how do we get out of it?

We are coming out of the worst recession since the Great Depression, but recovery is underway. We have seen 42

months of private sector job growth. That is 7.5 million jobs. That is hope for millions of families. We have had nine consecutive quarters of economic growth—the longest stretch since the recession hit in 2008. So we are slowly making our way back—not fast enough, with too many folks still struggling, and with great challenges for the future.

This is a time for leadership, for working together. Americans expect their leaders to act as grownups. But they feel they are watching a schoolyard spat. Is it any wonder they hold Congress in such contempt or that they worry about the kind of country they will leave their children?

Here is what we should be doing. We should have a farm bill by now. We should have comprehensive immigration reform, and we should have a serious budget—one that would get rid of sequestration's meat-cleaver cuts with targeted spending reductions, tackling the deficit, reforming the Tax Code, helping the middle class and small businesses, helping families and seniors who are struggling, moving ahead with smart investments in infrastructure, creating jobs, investing in our future.

The Senate passed that budget 6 months ago. But the House went in a completely different direction. Their budget put tax cuts for the richest Americans above funding for education and ensuring the safety of our roads and bridges.

Democrats and Republicans have differences. That is no surprise. But we still have a job to do. We still need to sit down and work it out. But a minority in the House has blocked our way forward—not once, not twice but time and time again.

American families and businesses need a long-term budget. Businesses do not hire on a monthly basis. They need certainty and the confidence that their government is working to create an environment for growth. We are giving them neither; instead, we lurch from crisis to crisis.

The worst thing about it is it does not have to be this way. This is a manufactured crisis, a series of self-inflicted wounds to our economy. The American people do not want this. They want a strong economy. They want jobs and a government that can actually get something done for the middle class, not just for Wall Street billionaires. The American people want a government that works, not a government shutdown.

There is no logic behind this crisis. Why are we here? Because the other side wants to kill the Affordable Care Act. I respect the diversity of views in America and in Congress. But the Affordable Care Act passed Congress like every other bill. It passed the House, it passed the Senate, and the President signed it. If Republicans want to repeal this law, they should make their case to the American people and work to pass their own health care law. What is happening is unprecedented, disruptive, and undemocratic behavior.

We heard a lot of indignation—hour after hour of it. But here is the thing: It does not stop the Affordable Care Act. This whole stunt has been a colossal waste of time, and wasting time is something we cannot afford. The real problems facing our Nation are still waiting.

Everyone outside of a radical group of obstructionists knows this is silly, knows this is misguided and dangerous to our economy.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the Business Roundtable, business leaders from coast to coast—there is a loud chorus of: Stop. This is enough. But, so far, it is not loud enough.

The Affordable Care Act is not perfect. I am not going to come here to the floor and say the Affordable Care Act is perfect. What law is? But it is the law of the land. It is being implemented. Shutting down the government does not change that. Here is what a shutdown does do: 27,000 Federal employees in my State could be furloughed and lose their income. Nearly half of the civilian workers for the Department of Defense will be sent home. In New Mexico, that is over 6,500 people who help defend this country, and they may not be paid.

Social Security applications could be jeopardized. Calls to SSA for help could go unanswered. Federal loans would be delayed for tens of thousands of folks trying to buy a home or applying for a small business loan. Those doors may be locked. National parks will close. So will museums and monuments.

This hurts the tourist economy in my State and hurts small businesses. During the last shutdown, 7 million tourists were turned away. Our veterans, who already face too many delays in their claims for benefits, could face even more. During the last shutdown, more than 400,000 veterans saw their disability and pension claims delayed.

Students will also be hurt. Work-study and Perkins loan payments would stop. Pregnant women and mothers who need nutrition assistance for their children may not get it. All of this is because the other side wants to send a message on ObamaCare? Well, it has a very high price, costing our Nation billions of dollars every day and hurting Federal agencies, including our critical national labs such as Los Alamos and Sandia, in their important national security mission.

Wall Street is on edge. Main Street is on edge. Families are worried. Communities suffer. There is another cost. The paralysis of government sends a terrible message, a terrible message of failure and dysfunction.

What is next? The debt ceiling. Holding the credit of the United States of America hostage for political gain. Instead of serious debate, we have ultimatums. Instead of regular order, we have midnight shutdowns. Instead of compromise, we have all or nothing, take it or leave it.

My friend from New Mexico, MSG Jesse Baca, summed it up well in an

interview with KOB-TV back home. He said:

I'm not angry. I'm frustrated because of the way we've always been taught to work together to get things done, you work together—and that just doesn't seem to be happening. Settle your differences.

Jessey is right. We need to start working together. We have not done that. So here we are on the wrong train, on the wrong track going nowhere. It is hurting families, hurting communities, could derail our economy with the recovery still under way.

The hard-working families of this country want a government that works, not one that shuts down just to send a message. Meanwhile, those families wait—wait for us to meet the real challenges that face our Nation and that make a real difference in their lives and the lives of their children.

Before I finish, I want to discuss the subcommittee I chair on Appropriations, the Financial Services and General Government Subcommittee. We work with agencies that are critical to keeping the economy running smoothly. I have to speak up and make sure that those who are causing this shutdown know exactly how badly the country needs the government to reopen. This shutdown is jeopardizing consumer safety. It is adding to the uncertainty facing our financial markets. It is doing real damage on our economy.

Our subcommittee funds the Small Business Administration. Small business owners are really going to take a hit in this shutdown. The SBA, Small Business Administration, is closed. I do not know about my colleagues, but the top concern I hear from small business owners in New Mexico is how hard it is to get a loan to expand. The SBA approves an average of \$86 million in loans to small businesses each day. But while the government is shut down, our Nation's job creators are not getting those resources. If the shutdown continues, 28 million small businesses will no longer be able to get capital from the SBA to expand.

There are other impacts too. Each day the government is closed our economy grinds down a little further. The shutdown is affecting the services that keep our capital markets safe. The CFTC, the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, will have just 4 percent of its normal staff during the shutdown. That means markets will be without effective oversight.

We are about to hit the debt ceiling, our Nation's borrowing limit. It is a potentially dangerous financial situation. The shutdown has put our watchdog at the CFTC and the SEC to sleep. Global markets are open, Wall Street is open, but investor protection agencies are closed. It is an open invitation to financial abuse.

The shutdown is also putting the safety of our children at risk. Christmas may seem far away, but companies are already working to get ready for the holiday season. They are shipping

goods in from overseas, including millions of toys. During this shutdown, only 22 employees at the Consumer Product Safety Commission will be available nationwide. That is 22 people to inspect millions of imported toys and gifts, gifts that American families will be putting under the Christmas tree. These agencies were created by Congress to protect American investors and consumers, to help small businesses. It is a travesty that tea party Republicans in the House have been allowed to hold the country hostage. That is unconscionable. Real people are being hurt, the people who are going without pay, without veterans' benefits or survivor benefits, without important financial and consumer protections.

You know the one that is the most devastating to me? People who are going without food. Here we are talking about millions of women and children in this country in poverty.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. REID. Madam President, it has been 7 days since we passed a piece of legislation to fund the government. I wonder how many days it will be that the Speaker makes the American people wait to open the government. How long is he going to make them wait before the government is open? It is a real hardship not only to the hundreds of thousands of Federal employees but the people who depend on the Federal employees for their own jobs. So it is very unfortunate.

GOLDEN GAVEL AWARD

Mr. REID. Madam President, we have not had a harder working Senator in the past 9 months than the Presiding Officer.

You have worked so hard doing so many different things, not the least of which is presiding over the Senate. You have presided over the Senate in the early morning hours, late-night hours. It is remarkable. I so appreciate your doing this. The entire Senate, Democrats and Republicans, has expressed their appreciation through me to the Presiding Officer for the good work you do in trying to make this place better. Not only do you preside, but you do a good job. You are dignified, and you do it with authority.

The people of Wisconsin are so fortunate to have the distinguished Presiding Officer as a Senator. I have had the good fortune to serve with a number of other Senators from Wisconsin. Russ Feingold was such a good friend. I miss him very much. Herb Kohl is a unique individual who added a great deal to the Senate with the many

things he did as a long-term member of the Appropriations Committee. However, none of the Senators I have served with from Wisconsin will outshine the distinguished Presiding Officer. You have been remarkably good. You have only been here a short period of time, but in the short period of time you have been here, you have had admirable dedication to this institution.

Senator BALDWIN is a native of Wisconsin—the first woman ever to represent that great State.

As frequently as you have presided, you have enjoyed a front-row seat. History is being made during this congressional session. Some of the sessions you have watched haven't been too much fun, but it has been good, and you have done such a remarkably good job.

On behalf of all of the Senators, I congratulate you and thank you for your service to the Senate. This is the first Golden Gavel Award. There will be a presentation made at our caucus this Tuesday to recognize your distinction. This is something that is traditional, the Golden Gavel. It is a beautiful memento we will present to you on Tuesday.

MARSHALL LEGACY INSTITUTE

Mr. REED. Madam President, I want to recognize the work of the Marshall Legacy Institute, MLI, and extend my congratulations on its 16th anniversary. While serving as Secretary of State, GEN George C. Marshall devised a plan to rebuild Europe after the devastation of World War II. Founded in 1997 on the 50th anniversary of the plan that bears General Marshall's name, the MLI's goal is to extend the plan's legacy by helping rebuild today's war torn countries.

Over the past 16 years, the MLI has focused on assisting severely mine-contaminated countries, like Bosnia and Herzegovina, Iraq, and Afghanistan, by clearing mines, offering survivors' assistance programs, and providing educational outreach to children. This work is vital to civilians who, when they are finally able to return to their homelands after war, often face the unpredictable threat of landmines. It is also critical to protecting the brave men and women of our Armed Forces, who risk their lives every day to defend our country and often serve where landmines pose a significant threat to their safety.

One such servicemember is PFC Barrett Austin, a combat engineer in the 4th Brigade Special Troops Battalion, 4th Infantry Brigade Combat Team, 3rd Infantry Division who bravely served our country in Afghanistan, and who died on April 21, 2013, after his vehicle was struck by an improvised explosive device. Private First Class Austin's dedicated service, selflessness, and sacrifice were the qualities that General Marshall exemplified and valued. It is therefore fitting that the MLI pay tribute to this soldier through its Mine De-

tection Dog Partnership Program by naming a mine detection dog in his honor.

I thank MLI for its 16 years of service, and for its continued efforts to make our world a safer place.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:32 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Chiappardi, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3230. An act making continuing appropriations during a Government shutdown to provide pay and allowances to members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces who perform inactive-duty training during such period.

H.J. Res. 72. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for veterans benefits for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

H.R. 3230. An act making continuing appropriations during a Government shutdown to provide pay and allowances to members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces who perform inactive-duty training during such period.

The following joint resolution was read the first time:

H.J. Res. 72. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for veterans benefits for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. CARPER (for himself, Mr. COBURN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. REID, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. CHIESA, Mr. COATS, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. HAGAN, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. HELLER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHANNES, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Mr. KIRK, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEE, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. REED, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr.