

Appropriations Committee will produce a bill that meets our national security needs, our compelling human needs, and at the same time lay the groundwork for a more prosperous America.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill and end gridlock and deadlock. Let's get on with making sure that we have certainty and reliability in funding the government of the United States of America.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. REED. Mr. President, in 12 days, unemployment insurance will expire for 1.3 million Americans. This will impact virtually every State. Over the course of the next year, it will set back millions of hard-working families, slow down job growth, and slow our economic recovery.

Today I filed three amendments to the Bipartisan Budget Agreement Act. The amendments would extend UI for 1 month, 3 months, or a year respectively. While I believe the best policy is to extend unemployment insurance for 1 year in order to keep our economic recovery moving forward, I am willing to work with my colleagues who object to extending it for the full year to find a path forward.

What we must, I think, provide is at least a message to those people that they will not see their benefits eliminated on December 28, and that we will, in fact, be working to make sure that this protection is in place for families all across this country. Over the next several days I will be coming to the floor seeking consent and urging my colleagues to extend unemployment insurance.

The expiration of unemployment insurance will be devastating to families across the entire Nation who rely on this as the last remaining source of support, in many cases for people who have worked hard for many years and because of this economy have lost their jobs.

This is a stressful time.

My home State of Rhode Island has an unemployment rate of 9.2 percent. We have been struggling since 2008 and 2009. This is very difficult for people. This difficulty will be particularly hard to bear as we celebrate the holidays—at a time when people should be able to consider and count their blessings—they will instead be looking ahead a few days afterward to the loss of valuable, irreplaceable income.

It is also a devastating blow to our local businesses and economy. Extend-

ing UI is not only doing the right thing for American families, this is doing the right and smart thing for the American economy.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that if we fail to extend unemployment insurance, we will lose 200,000 jobs—at a time when our major priority should be getting as many jobs as we can—and will slow economic growth by about .2 percent GDP.

This is not only the right thing to do in terms of the families of America, it is the smart and right thing to do for our economy. There is a compelling, economic rationale to provide these extended unemployment insurance benefits.

Mark Zandi, a noted economist, estimates that for every \$1 we put into the UI Program we get \$1.55 in return of economic activity. It makes sense. People who are living without their income from employment, when they take this money, they go to the store, they put food on the table, they pay rent. They pay for heat in the Northeast where the President pro tempore resides.

They are not stashing it away. In some cases, they are putting it right back into the economy. So this is a wise, economic policy, as well as a humane and decent policy.

Now is not the time to let this program expire for the individuals or for the economy. We have to extend UI immediately. December 28 is the day it stops; it is a cliff. People are off the program. Then, throughout the year, as people exhaust their State benefits at 26 weeks, they fall off because there is no Unemployment Insurance Program.

This is an economy where we are just beginning to see some recovery. Last month's numbers suggested about a 200,000-job gain. That was good, but hidden in those statistics was increasing evidence that long-term unemployment is increasing. Those people who haven't found jobs quickly are not finding jobs very well at all.

That trend is continuing and that is another reason we need the long-term benefits that are provided by the Federal program.

I am going to do my best to try to bring people together to recognize that this is an issue that is about American workers. People don't get unemployment insurance unless they have worked. It is about American families, because it is so necessary to support these families, and it is about States all across this country. Rhode Island has a 9.2-percent unemployment record. Nevada is the highest with 9.3 percent.

We can look at States—North, South, East, West—scattered across this country that have unemployment rates over 8 percent that need this program for their residents. I hope we can come together, work together, and get this done.

I urge, again, in the next few days that we all stop and think about our obligations, not only to the families of

America but to keeping the momentum of economic growth moving forward. I would particularly ask those colleagues who are representing States with unemployment rates that are above the national average—and the national average is 7 percent—to think very hard about what they are going to tell many of their constituents on December 28 when they have lost their benefits.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Mr. COATS. I know we will be voting shortly. The narrative out of the White House is that this health care plan is starting to work. That is not what I am hearing from home, and many are questioning this.

The Wall Street Journal today published an analysis showing how the health care law will raise premium rates. We all are familiar with the President's promise that rates will not increase under the ObamaCare, Affordable Care Act. According to The Wall Street Journal, Americans—particularly young, healthy adults—"could see insurance rates double or even triple when they look to buy individual coverage." Other groups, Oliver Wyman, PricewaterhouseCoopers, and Milliman, all issued reports estimating that ObamaCare would increase premiums by up to 60 percent.

On and on this drama goes with broken promises. The American people are learning and discovering promises were made when this law was passed—and all through the 3½ years leading up to where we are—and assurances were coming from the President and the White House: Don't worry. Your premiums won't go up, period. You can keep the doctor that you have, period. It is not going to cost any more money, period.

Those promises have been broken and Hoosiers are finding out about this every day.

Regardless of the statements coming out—don't worry, everything is going to be OK, sort of take it to the bank, trust us—that is not what is happening on the ground.

People are writing to me. They are calling our office. They are tweeting, emailing, and doing everything they can to give us these horror stories, saying: Do I have to do this?

Unfortunately, they do. Edward from Chesterton, IN, said he has spent countless hours on healthcare.gov searching for a health care plan. He discovered that the plans offered under the ObamaCare exchange had expensive premiums that he hadn't anticipated. In order to afford the monthly premiums, he has to choose the plan for

his family with unaffordable deductibles in order to keep his premiums at the level he can afford to pay. It is basically: Edward, don't get sick. Don't have a medical expense throughout your family every year, and you will be OK. But if you do, what you didn't pay in premiums you are going to have to pay in much higher deductibles.

John from Martinsville, IN, was finally able to get on the healthcare.gov Web site. He found the bronze plan that was going to be at least \$100 more per month. He doesn't qualify for a government subsidy, and he doesn't see any way this new law will be saving money for his family. John says the only thing he sees is that he now will be subsidizing the health care system even more than before the law was passed.

DeWayne from Shipshewana, IN, wrote to tell me that not only is the small group health insurance plan his business currently offers not available any longer starting in 2014, but in his 15 years of administering the business health plans, he said he has never seen a rate increase this high.

DeWayne's health insurance plan for him and his business employees will increase 65 percent in this coming year. DeWayne's small group health insurance is increasing 65 percent for 2014—and this is called the Affordable Care Act?

I wish to give one more broken promise. William from Granger, IN, wrote and told me that his wife who works as a part-time nurse will no longer be offered health care since she works part-time. I assume they have children at home or maybe the hospital has determined they want to stay under that 40-hour workweek level, so they put her on part-time. I am not exactly sure what the case is.

In any event, they have discovered they will have premiums rise from \$11,544 a year under their current plan to \$19,076 per year, an increase of over \$7,500.

He goes on to say: "So much for [the President's promise] if you like your plan . . . if you like your doctor . . . your costs will go down by \$2,500."

William's costs go up by \$7,500.

This isn't only Republicans in Washington highlighting these health care costs. These are Hoosiers from all backgrounds, Republicans, Democrats, and from all walks of life, sharing their stories with me about how they are paying the price for the President's broken promises.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF ANNE W. PATTERSON TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE (NEAR EASTERN AFFAIRS)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Anne W. Patterson, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Career Ambassador, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Near Eastern Affairs).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all postcloture time has expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Anne W. Patterson, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of State?

Mr. COATS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL), and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) would have voted "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 78, nays 16, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 274 Ex.]

YEAS—78

Ayotte	Durbin	Levin
Baldwin	Feinstein	Manchin
Baucus	Fischer	Markey
Begich	Flake	McCaskill
Bennet	Franken	McConnell
Blumenthal	Gillibrand	Menendez
Booker	Grassley	Merkley
Boozman	Hagan	Mikulski
Boxer	Harkin	Murkowski
Brown	Hatch	Murphy
Burr	Heinrich	Murray
Cantwell	Heitkamp	Nelson
Cardin	Hirono	Portman
Carper	Hoeven	Pryor
Casey	Inhofe	Reed
Chambliss	Isakson	Reid
Coats	Johnson (SD)	Rockefeller
Cochran	Johnson (WI)	Sanders
Collins	Kaine	Schatz
Coons	King	Schumer
Corker	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cornyn	Landrieu	Stabenow
Donnelly	Leahy	Tester

Thune
Toomey
Udall (CO)

Udall (NM)
Warner
Warren
Whitehouse
Wicker
Wyden

NAYS—16

Alexander	Heller	Rubio
Barrasso	Johanns	Scott
Coburn	Lee	Sessions
Crapo	Moran	Shelby
Cruz	Risch	
Enzi	Roberts	

NOT VOTING—6

Blunt	Kirk	Paul
Graham	McCaIn	Vitter

The nomination was confirmed.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The 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 the nomination of Jeh Charles Johnson, of New Jersey, to be Secretary of Homeland Security.

Harry Reid, Sherrod Brown, Christopher Murphy, Robert Menendez, Christopher A. Coons, Angus S. King, Jr., Martin Heinrich, Amy Klobuchar, Dianne Feinstein, Tom Udall, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Bernard Sanders, Barbara Boxer, Brian Schatz, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Thomas R. Carper, Benjamin L. Cardin, Michael F. Bennet.

QUORUM CALL

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair now directs the clerk to call the roll to ascertain the presence of a quorum.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll and the following Senators entered the Chamber and answered to their names:

[Quorum No. 13]

Alexander	Grassley	Nelson
Ayotte	Harkin	Portman
Baldwin	Hatch	Pryor
Barrasso	Heinrich	Reid
Baucus	Heitkamp	Risch
Bennet	Heller	Roberts
Booker	Hoeven	Rockefeller
Boozman	Isakson	Sanders
Boxer	Johnson (WI)	Schatz
Brown	King	Schumer
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Scott
Cardin	Landrieu	Sessions
Coats	Leahy	Shaheen
Coburn	Lee	Stabenow
Cochran	Manchin	Thune
Cornyn	Markey	Toomey
Crapo	McConnell	Udall (NM)
Donnelly	Menendez	Warner
Durbin	Merkley	Warren
Feinstein	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Fischer	Murkowski	
Franken	Murray	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Jeh Charles Johnson, of New Jersey, to be Secretary of Homeland Security, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator