

assess and document whether Federal financial support of its initiatives is actually needed. Yet the President's budget, released 1 month later, recommends an unprecedented level of \$144 million for the DOE wind energy program, just in 2014.

Wind's windfall from DOE comes on the heels of yet another extension of the multibillion dollar wind production tax credit. This tax credit was temporarily established more than two decades ago to encourage investment in the then-fledgling wind industry. This is two decades ago. Congress gave energy a 7-year window to take advantage of and prepare for the expiration of the original PTC in 1999—given 7 years.

But to the surprise of no one, parochial interests and a host of extensions continue to keep this zombie subsidy from expiring as designed. Today, as the credit supporters repeat their plea for just 1 more extension, they ignore America's debt-ridden reality and so the walking dead wind production tax credit, which is little more than a taxpayer-funded entitlement program, lives on. While I have singled out automotive and wind programs at DOE, similar arguments could be made for reducing or eliminating the Department's support for other established industries, including oil, natural gas, solar, and nuclear. Many of these programs are both unnecessary for further development of these technologies and are blatantly duplicative.

In fact, another GAO study identified a mind-boggling 679 renewable energy initiatives across 23 agencies in fiscal year 2010. Prominently featured in a report by my colleague from Oklahoma Senator COBURN, these redundant programs cost \$15 billion in 2010 alone.

Instead of continuing to pick winners and losers, Congress needs to reduce its footprint in well-established areas of the energy sector. Not only will this help level the playing field for emergency energy technologies that are actually preparing to compete in the marketplace, it would save taxpayers untold billions of dollars.

With just 1 month to go before the budget deadline, I urge my colleagues to reject the urge to fixate on raising taxes and instead help focus negotiations on smart, achievable spending reductions. By eliminating waste and prioritizing spending within the BCA framework, we can shore up this country's fiscal future. Turning out the lights on wasteful programs at the Department of Energy would be a step in the right direction.

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

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

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

COSPONSORSHIP

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to join the resolution which has been submitted by Senator DURBIN, and also a separate resolution submitted by Senators COLLINS and KLOBUCHAR, relating to the fight against Alzheimer's disease.

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

ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, all of us have been touched by this dread and pernicious disease. Alzheimer's strikes families, loved ones, colleagues, coworkers, friends, acquaintances—literally all of us—increasingly so because the numbers are multiplying almost epidemic-like across the country. Of course, classifying it as an epidemic is difficult to do because we scarcely understand this disease. We are only beginning to comprehend the cause and modus operandi of this pernicious ailment.

I am joining on these resolutions because of the need to express and call attention to the deadly and insidious spread of Alzheimer's and the Nation's failure to effectively address it. We know that the numbers of people suffering from Alzheimer's are increasing drastically and this resolution rightly calls attention to the dimensions of the problem. But as important as those numbers are, even more so are the numbers of dollars that reflect the Nation's failure to take action that is so desperately needed.

As my colleague from Maine highlighted earlier, we spend \$500 million in research for Alzheimer's compared to \$6 billion for cancer, \$3 billion for HIV, and \$2 billion for cardiovascular efforts. These numbers do not reflect any excess spending on cardiovascular or cancer or other kinds of medical problems for which the National Institutes of Health does such great work, as well as others in the private sector, and philanthropic donations as well. If anything, perhaps we should be considering expanding those efforts. But the numbers do reflect the disproportion and inadequacy of what we as a nation are spending on the research of Alzheimer's. The estimate, according to the National Alzheimer's Project Act and its representatives, is in the neighborhood of \$2 billion a year, as a minimum, that we should be spending to develop diagnoses, cures, and treatment. We should be doubling or tripling funding. Yet even this minimal funding is in danger due to the sequester, which has also jeopardized many other research projects supported by the National Institutes of Health. This abdication of responsibility is a tragedy for us as a generation who will suffer from it in untold numbers, and for the next generation that could be saved from this disease.

I am proud to join in this effort to match the severity of the challenge

with public consciousness and awareness and, even more importantly, public dollars and resources that are vitally important to ensure we conquer and cure as many Alzheimer's patients as we can as quickly as possible. We owe it to ourselves and our children.

There are many ways in life to feel alone. There are many forms of isolation. Even in this body, surrounded by people, Members can be alone at points—alone in championing causes or alone in thought, but there are few conditions that match the aloneness of an Alzheimer's patient. They are often cut off from the world by an inability to communicate, and we must reach out to those patients who cannot let us know and describe, as they might want to do, their aloneness and their resolve.

So for them and all of our loved ones—friends, family, and coworkers—who now and in the future will suffer from the disease, let us resolve to do more through this resolution, and as a nation we will confront this challenge.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, this has been a long process and a difficult one for me to go through. Being the ranking member on the Armed Services Committee, I have had constant contact with both the Democrats and Republicans on this bill. I consider this bill to be the most important bill of the year, and I have said that several times. I have given several speeches up here in the last week. I had about decided with the last offer that was made by our side, which was to come up with 50 amendments, limit it to 50 amendments, the argument there is that would not be 50 votes. If you look at it historically—and I have the numbers going all the way back for the last 15 years—for last year, for example, we had 106 amendments, and only 34 were voice-voted and only 8 were recorded votes. So when we say 50, we are only talking about probably 20. Now, of course, the Democrats would only have 50 also.

So what I have decided I am going to do—because I have to decide what I am going to do with my vote—I am either going to vote for or against cloture on my own bill.

That would be very awkward for me to have to determine. But I have tried to get ahold of Senator PAT TOOMEY, who is kind of the lead person on the steering committee and the one where most of the amendments would come from, most of the objections have come

from. I have said: If you will pare that down from 50 to 25, then I am sure it would be reasonable for the Democrats to have 25. That is a total of 50. Probably it would end up being maybe 20 recorded votes if you, our Republicans, are willing to bring that number down and say: Yes, we will go forward with this bill if we can have 25—move it down from 50 to 25. Now, if we refuse to do that, I am going to go ahead and vote to support cloture and to support our bill.

On the other hand, if Senator TOOMEY and the rest of the Republicans say: No, we want to have all 50—and I look at this list, and I see we have some Members who have as many as 9, and I do not think that is being totally reasonable—so if they say: No, we are not going to bring our number down to 25, then I am going to support the bill. However, if they do agree to bring it down—and I have already talked to the majority side about this—and they refuse to come down to 25, then I would join in opposing cloture on the bill when it comes up.

So I want to make sure there is no misunderstanding right now. I would like to say that I could get ahold of everyone tonight. I have tried. They said at 7:30 they are going to make a decision. It is 7:29 now, so I had to get on record. I do not have time.

I will repeat it one more time. If the Republicans refuse to bring their number down to 25, then I will go ahead and support the bill and support passage of the bill through cloture. If they do agree to do it and the Democratic side, the majority side, decides they are not going to accept the 25 offer, then I will oppose and vote against cloture on the bill.

There you have it.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014—Continued

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have a cloture motion at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on S. 1197, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2014 for military activities of the Department of

Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

Harry Reid, Carl Levin, Richard J. Durbin, Tim Kaine, Dianne Feinstein, Kay R. Hagan, Barbara A. Mikulski, Joe Donnelly, Mark Udall, Claire McCaskill, Christopher A. Coons, Jeanne Shaheen, Mark R. Warner, Jack Reed, Patty Murray, Bill Nelson, Angus S. King, Jr.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum required under rule XXII be waived.

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

BUDGETARY IMPACTS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, it has been only a few short weeks since the needless government shutdown that cost the Treasury more than \$20 billion, disrupted the lives of hundreds of thousands of Federal workers and their families in every State, threatened to wreak havoc with the world's financial markets, and accomplished nothing.

But an important deadline, one critical to determining how we resolve the current budget crisis, is just a few days away. While this approaching deadline does not come with the threat of another government shutdown, if Congress is going to complete work on appropriations bills before the continuing resolution expires on January 15, we need a top-line number from the budget conferees by the end of this week.

By Friday, the budget conferees need to find enough common ground to agree on a level to fund the Federal Government for the remainder of the fiscal year. While many have expressed their doubts, there is no reason this cannot be done. People are fed up with putting the process of setting and funding our national priorities on autopilot. It is an abdication of responsibility and a wasteful way to do business.

It is equally important that the level of funding replace sequestration. A long-term continuing resolution that funds the government at the House level of \$967 billion would be a disaster. Sequestration would become the new normal, funding programs and agencies at levels far below those passed by the Senate Appropriations Committee and below fiscal year 2013.

It is stunning—and frightening—that instead of looking to replace sequestration's devastating cuts, we hear from some Members that it is "working." If their intention is to stunt the eco-

nomic recovery and indiscriminately slash services upon which American families and businesses depend, then I guess they are right. But I don't think most Members of Congress, or most Americans, see it that way.

For those of us who want to support our communities and invigorate and sustain our economic recovery, another year of sequestration would be catastrophic. While we are still trying to gauge the full impact of the first round of cuts this year, one thing is clear—another year would be far worse.

Agencies have exhausted their carry-over funds and creative budgeting options to avoid layoffs, furloughs, and eliminating programs.

Absent a budget agreement, the entire Federal Government, from the Department of Defense to the Department of Labor, will suffer significant, mindless cuts. I have spoken several times about the impact of another full year continuing resolution at the House's funding level.

I want to take a minute to describe what it would mean for America's children, teachers, and families. LIHEAP, which provides lifesaving home energy assistance, would not receive the \$325 million increase over the level included in a continuing resolution, cutting off assistance to about 760,000 more households this winter and next summer. Nearly 40,000 Vermont families rely on LIHEAP in the cold Vermont winters.

Early Head Start Programs won't be expanded as the Senate appropriations bill intended, and the 177,000 children who would have received Head Start services will be turned away. Nearly 1,600 Vermont children depend on this assistance every year.

Schools around the country already facing budget shortfalls look to the Federal Government to fund services to disadvantaged children through title I grants. Those schools would not receive the \$852 million included in the Senate appropriations bill. They would have to look elsewhere for money to provide those services to 1.3 million students in need.

Schools would also lose \$748 million in grants for special education that were included in the Senate appropriations bill, to help cover the costs of employing more than 9,000 additional special education aides in our schools.

NIH would not receive the \$2 billion in additional funds included in the Senate appropriations bill and instead would not be able to award 1,300 new research grants. This means that 1,300 additional opportunities to achieve scientific advances that could lead to lifesaving treatments and cures would be missed opportunities.

Under a continuing resolution, 159,000 families looking for assistance through the section 8 housing program to help keep a roof over their heads will be turned away because the funding won't be there. In Vermont, 774 families would face losing their housing assistance.