

obligations of the United States Government until December 31, 2014, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 53, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 216 Leg.]

YEAS—53

Baldwin	Harkin	Murray
Baucus	Heinrich	Nelson
Begich	Heitkamp	Pryor
Bennet	Hirono	Reed
Blumenthal	Johnson (SD)	Rockefeller
Boxer	Kaine	Sanders
Brown	King	Schatz
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cardin	Landrieu	Shaheen
Carper	Leahy	Stabenow
Casey	Levin	Tester
Coons	Manchin	Udall (CO)
Donnelly	Markey	Udall (NM)
Durbin	McCaskey	Warner
Feinstein	Menendez	Warren
Franken	Merkley	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Mikulski	Wyden
Hagan	Murphy	

NAYS—45

Alexander	Enzi	Moran
Ayotte	Fischer	Murkowski
Barrasso	Flake	Paul
Blunt	Graham	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Reid
Burr	Hatch	Risch
Chambliss	Heller	Roberts
Chiesa	Hoeven	Rubio
Coats	Isakson	Scott
Cochran	Johanns	Sessions
Collins	Johnson (WI)	Shelby
Corker	Kirk	Thune
Cornyn	Lee	Toomey
Crapo	McCain	Vitter
Cruz	McConnell	Wicker

NOT VOTING—2

Coburn	Inhofe
--------	--------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 53, the nays are 45. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, was I originally recorded as “yes”?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. REID. The record should reflect that I have changed that to “no.”

Mr. President, I enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which cloture was not invoked on the motion to proceed to S. 1569.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is entered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to speak now during our morning hour business for up to 10 minutes each.

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

Mr. REID. I have just been told by my able assistant here that we are still on the motion to proceed. So we are not in morning business.

Now, Mr. President, just a quick announcement: Democrats will caucus in the Mansfield Room forthwith, right now.

Mr. President, I think it would be appropriate for everyone—this has been cleared with Senator McCONNELL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. REID. Following the remarks of Senator LANDRIEU and Senator JOHANNIS, I would ask that—well, I will say that the Senate will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

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

The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I know the Members of the Senate are going to be retiring to caucuses to try to figure out how we are going to move forward, and I am confident, with the good work of the people in this Chamber, we will find a way.

Senator JOHANNIS and I have been working, along with many of our colleagues, to try to come to some resolution about funding a city in the United States, the District of Columbia, that is not an agency of the Federal Government that happens to be the city that the seat of government sits in.

While I am not going to ask for consent now, I want to, through the Chair, ask Senator JOHANNIS to express, if he could, a few views about this, as we try to work our way forward for sometime maybe later this afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. JOHANNIS. Mr. President, I appreciate the good working relationship with Senator LANDRIEU. We have been talking back and forth. We exchanged phone calls through the evening—never quite did connect—but we have been talking here today. It is our desire to find a solution to this issue.

We understand that what the District of Columbia is asking for is the simple ability to use its funding. We are talking and working, and I am optimistic we are going to find a solution.

I would also say, as a former mayor, I can only understand the sleepless nights the mayor is going through. So both of us want to try to solve this issue, and I think the Senate does.

What I would like to do is continue our conversations over the next hour or so. They have been fruitful, and I think we are working our way toward a solution.

I appreciate the opportunity to work with Senator LANDRIEU.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I yield the floor.

• Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I am opposed to S. 1569. Our national debt is nearly \$17 trillion and has nearly doubled since the beginning of the Obama administration. If we allow the Nation to continue on its current path, it will only lead to economic destruction. Raising the debt ceiling without any strings attached would be irresponsible and reckless.

The President has already increased the debt limit five times since coming to office. The first occurred just a month after President Obama took office. At \$789 billion, the increase was provided to pay for his massive, unsuccessful stimulus package.

With supermajorities in the House and the Senate, the President was able to push nearly everything he wanted into law.

Because the stimulus package ended up being more expensive than expected, the President got another increase of \$290 billion just 10 months later. Then, just 2 months after that, the President pushed another increase through, this time for \$1.9 trillion. Thirteen months into his Presidency, President Obama had already increased the debt limit by nearly \$3 trillion.

Then, following the 2010 midterm elections, Republicans in Congress welcomed reinforcements, which changed the dynamic. With control of the House and an increased margin in the Senate, Republicans were able to force spending cut concessions from the President before agreeing to any debt limit increase.

In August 2010, after nearly exceeding the debt limit, the President agreed to increase the debt limit by \$2.1 trillion in exchange for \$2.1 trillion in spending cuts, including what has become known as sequestration. While I supported the total reduction in spending enacted by the bill, I voted against it because I believe the cuts should have been allocated in a different way. In total, nearly \$1 trillion was cut from national security spending, which is having a very real, hollowing effect on our ability to protect the Nation. Further, these cuts did not include anything from mandatory entitlement programs like food stamps, and too little of it came from other domestic programs that are better suited for the States to run.

Earlier this year, the President demanded another debt limit increase. He received it, but only after agreeing to force Senate Democrats to consider a budget, which until this year had never been done during the Obama administration. This bill also suspended Congressional pay until a budget was agreed to. I oppose this bill because I do not believe that simply passing a budget was enough. Real spending cuts with real reforms to our permanent programs are needed.

Today we find ourselves in the same situation, and my position has not changed. Spending is continuing to spiral out of control, and if we do nothing to rein it in, our national debt will skyrocket to \$25 trillion in the next decade. Even the President agrees with those numbers. We cannot allow this to happen, which is why I oppose S. 1569. •

RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate stands in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:36 p.m., recessed subject to the call of the Chair and reassembled at 2:16 p.m. when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. HEINRICH).

DEFAULT PREVENTION ACT OF 2013—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President. I understand that we are in session for Senators to speak for up to 10 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the Presiding Officer.

Mr. President, we are here on Saturday, and we just had a very significant vote in the Senate. The vote was on whether we would move to a bill, fully debatable, to raise the debt ceiling without any strings attached.

The Republicans, en bloc, voted against that. As a result—since we need 60 votes to bring a bill to the floor—the vote was 53 to 45. There should be no mistake in anyone's mind. This was a very clear vote, simply to move to a bill, fully debatable, amendable even, but the Republicans would not even vote to go to that bill today.

Quite frankly, I must admit that when I was driving in to the Senate, I was thinking about this. I thought what we will do is that we will get on the bill. Obviously they will vote for cloture to proceed to the bill, and then we will get on the bill. I was wondering to myself how long we will have to be on the bill, what kinds of amendments would be offered, and then would we have to file cloture on that bill also.

I was quite surprised to see every Republican vote against even going to the bill. It begs credulity. I am incredulous at this, especially with the markets opening in Asia later tomorrow, on Sunday. How are they going to read this? I think if we had voted to at least move to the bill and debated it, they would have stabilized somewhat because they would say at least they are willing to talk about it. Now they can look at the bill and say simply, Republicans are not going to discuss this.

It is shocking that this would have transpired today at this last minute. No one gave up anything in the bill. It was simply to move to the bill, and the Republicans said no.

We have been closed for 2 weeks. I have come to the floor several times, as I know others have, to talk about this irresponsible and dangerous episode in our Nation's history. I understand that different groups are coming together trying to float some kind of an idea.

I hope something comes of it. I truly hope cooler heads will prevail and we will reach some agreement that will allow the government to reopen, allow the debt ceiling to be extended with no strings attached for at least 1 year or more—at least to get us through the next elections of 2014—and then we ought to go to negotiations.

Our Budget Committee passed a budget. The House passed its budget. They should meet and try to work it out in conference. Our Appropriations Committee passed our bills. The House

hasn't passed all of them. Then we could go to work and work these things out in the next 6 weeks, up to December 1. I hope that works and we get that kind of a compromise, but I do not want to see some kind of compromise which says to one side or the other that you have to do this or you have to do that.

It should be open. Our Budget Committee is under the able guidance and direction of Senator MURRAY of Washington. I am not a member of the Budget Committee, but they ought to go to conference without any strings attached or some artificial levels put in. They ought to take what we passed as the budget, as the House did.

What is happening is that—and it is getting worse every day, another week, another 2 weeks—it is unfathomable how many more people are going to be hurt.

A lot of Americans may think sequestration wasn't a big deal or that closing the government wasn't. I saw a piece in the paper where some tea party people were meeting. What came through is they weren't being directly hit or hurt by the government shut-down.

One respondent was quoted in the paper as saying: We need to go back to the late 1800s, the way this country ran then, where everybody grew their own vegetables.

I would say to that person: If you want to grow your own vegetables, you can grow your own vegetables. If you want to live somewhere without electricity, air conditioning, with no health care, and never go to the doctor, you should be able to do that. But why should you make the rest of the country go back to the 1800s?

This is what a handful of people are trying to do. They can't do it legislatively, they can't do it through the courts, they can't do it politically, and they can't win elections on that basis. So they are trying to do it by holding a gun to our heads, keeping the government closed, and threatening to default on the full faith and credit of the United States.

I wish to say in the few minutes I have remaining what another yearlong sequester would mean in human terms. These are things that come under the jurisdiction of my Appropriations Committee, which I have been privileged to chair or where I have been the ranking member since 1989. We have never had these kinds of problems before—Republicans or Democrats—when Republicans ran it or Democrats. I have been back and forth on this many times, in terms of Republicans chairing it—Democrats, Republicans, Democrats. We have never had these kinds of problems.

If we go 1 more year under sequester, that means 177,000 fewer children will get Head Start services—177,000—and 1.3 million fewer students will receive Title I education assistance. What is Title I? This goes to the poorest kids, the poorest families, the poorest areas.

So 1.3 million low-income kids won't be helped.

Oh, our kids will be fine, kids from the middle class, the upper class, and of Senators and Congressman. They have money. I am talking about the poor kids, and there are 1.3 million.

There are 760,000 fewer households that would receive less heating and cooling assistance under the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program, LIHEAP, and mostly they are elderly poor people.

There will be 9,000 fewer special education staff in the classroom. In other words, under IDEA we provide money for special education teachers and support staff for special education students, and 9,000 will be cut.

There will be \$291 million less for childcare subsidies for working families, for people who need childcare subsidies. They are low income, they are going to work every day, but they need some childcare help—\$291 million cut away from that. How many will not be able to go to work or what will they do with those children? Will they put them in substandard childcare facilities?

One thing that is mind-boggling is we have a program in Medicare that goes after fraud, waste, and abuse. We know from the past that for every dollar that we put into that, we actually recover \$7.90. I don't mean something phony. I mean we actually bring back \$7.90 for every \$1 dollar we put into it.

Because of the cut under sequester that means in the next year there will be \$2.7 billion that we will not recover. By reducing the number of people in the fraud, waste and abuse section, that means it opens the door to fraud. People say: Oh, they are not there. They are not checking, right?

People say: Well, now we are going to give them flexibility under sequester. But there is no flexibility. That has to be cut.

Another yearlong continuing resolution under sequester means \$2 billion less for the National Institutes of Health, which means 1,300 fewer research grants.

Again, I would say that people say: Well, we will give flexibility. My colleague on the other side says: We will have sequester, but we will leave flexibility to the departments.

Let's see how that goes.

The funds for the Administration for Children and Families—what would they do? Would they preserve Head Start slots by cutting childcare subsidies?

At NIH, would you preserve cancer research by cutting Alzheimer's research? These are terrible choices. Flexibility does not answer these questions. It is not the answer.

When they talk about flexibility, I know what is on their mind—military spending. Everybody likes to talk about the sequester and the level of sequester. Do you know what the House did? A sequester says it is 50/50, 50 percent cut from defense, 50 percent from