

healthcare should not be a partisan issue because outside of the four corners of this Capitol, it should not matter if you are a Democrat or a Republican or an Independent—we should all not want people to have spikes in their health insurance costs.

In a matter of days, tens of millions of people all across the country are going to get letters in the mail, saying: Your monthly premium, starting January 1, is going to be more than double what you pay now—more than double.

That is not my speculating. That is not my allegation. That is not a political talking point that was cooked up in some Democratic lab. That is what the Kaiser Family Foundation analysis shows, that premiums will increase on average by 114 percent per person—not 14 percent; 114 percent.

That is just the average. Some people's rates will be changed based on their income level. Say you make \$35,000 a year. You are now going to be paying almost \$1,600 more per year for coverage. And if you are a family of four making 75 grand, you are going to be paying more than 3,000 extra dollars.

I just encourage everybody who is watching—all of my colleagues, all of the staff, all of the members of the media—to talk to anyone in your hometown. Most people just don't have that kind of money lying around. If you are a family living paycheck to paycheck, if you are a young couple saving up to buy a home, if you are a small business owner already cutting back on costs because everything is more expensive now, what are you supposed to do?

This is not a crisis the Democrats have cooked up to score political points. The reason for the urgency is that October 1 is the day that people are going to get letters from their insurance carriers telling them that this is happening. Open enrollment begins in exactly a month.

People are scared about how they are going to pay for their healthcare or if they are going to have it at all. There are a lot of people who just can't absorb this extra cost. It is not like you can buy a little less of something. When you are at the grocery store—for instance, vegetables are now 39 percent more expensive. Well, you still have some money in your pocket. You are going to buy fewer vegetables and more of the cheap stuff, which is why, by the way, Hamburger Helper purchases have spiked.

So people are making these adjustments to the fact that everything has gotten more expensive, but with health insurance, you can't turn the dial like that. You can't buy a little less health insurance. You either can absorb the cost or you cannot, and if you cannot, you will go without health insurance.

Here is the thing that people need to understand: This directly impacts about 24 million people, OK? That is enough for us to, like, pay enough attention and try to come up with a bipartisan solution. But the truth is that

we already know what happens when people lose their health insurance, right? They end up getting sicker and sicker, and at some point, they present themselves to emergency rooms.

Everybody understands—kind of intuitively, but there is plenty of data to back this up—that when you present yourself at an emergency room when you are already supersick, you require a bunch of very expensive interventions, and that cost is distributed among the rest of us who still have insurance.

So it is not just the 24 million Americans who are going to pay more for health insurance and some number of millions of those Americans who are just not going to have insurance at all, it is also a mathematical certainty that the increased stupidity of the system, the increased extent to which the system now makes even less sense than it does already—we are all going to eat the cost, whether you are on the so-called exchange or not.

Look, Republicans are in charge of Washington. We lost the election. Elections—consequences. I get it. When we had the trifecta, we did a bunch of things to reduce the price of prescription medicine, to build infrastructure, to fix the post office, to do the Respect for Marriage Act, to pass the Inflation Reduction Act. We did a bunch of stuff, and Republicans are doing a bunch of stuff, but we are trying to hand our Republican colleagues a lifeline because prices are going to spike everywhere.

I said this yesterday, and I mean this: If we were a little more cynical, we might just say “This is your problem; why don't you guys just stew in it?” because this is, frankly, electorally, a very powerful issue. People are going to be really pissed when they get these letters in the mail. They really are. So the supercynical, election-oriented thing for us to do would be simply to say “Good luck with all that.”

But maybe it is the strength of the Democratic caucus, maybe it is the weakness of the Democratic caucus, but we just care too much about people to let that happen. So we are simply asking, in the context of this shutdown, to jump-start a negotiation about how to prevent a 114-percent increase in the cost of healthcare for 24 million Americans.

Look, the cost of electricity is not just up; it is double the inflation rate. The cost of groceries is spiking. The cost of raw materials to build a house—spiking. The cost of basically anything you want to buy at a Walmart or a Costco or a Target or a Safeway or a Food Lion or wherever you go is spiking. All of that is a consequence of both inflation and tariffs. But this thing is a public policy. This is intentional to spike these rates.

We are saying: Are you guys sure you want to do this?

We are about to find out whether they are sure that they want to impose a doubling of insurance costs on 24 million Americans.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1377

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, yesterday, I came to the floor to warn that a critical cyber security protection that has been in place for a decade was set to run out and expire at the end of the fiscal year. I urged my colleagues to pass a bipartisan, clean, 10-year extension to keep these important national security protections in place.

Unfortunately, one of my colleagues—just one of my colleagues—objected, and as of midnight, they have now expired. As a result, we are without this critical line of defense. Our economy, our infrastructure, and our government are exposed.

It is now going to be a more challenging effort to protect businesses and critical infrastructure against cyber attacks at a time, Mr. President, when you know that our adversaries' attacks continue to grow more aggressive and more sophisticated.

This law was passed with strong bipartisan support, and the support remains strong in both Chambers. Even the Trump administration agrees. The White House and the Department of Homeland Security support a 10-year extension and want to see this bill passed.

For months, my colleagues and I have heard from a broad coalition of industry leaders who need the long-term certainty that a 10-year reauthorization provides so we can protect our systems and customers. That is why Senator ROUNDS and I introduced a clean, bipartisan, 10-year extension all the way back in April.

Every hour—every hour—we delay is an open invitation to cyber criminals and hostile actors to attack our economy and our critical infrastructure.

I would urge my colleagues to put our national and economic security first and pass this clean, long-term extension.

Mr. President, as if in legislative session and notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be discharged from further consideration of S. 1377 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, as you know, the CISA reauthorization is also included in the clean CR that we are also trying to be able to pass, this continuing resolution.

On behalf of Chairman PAUL, he has asked me to be able to come and object, so I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, the CR has not passed. We are now vulnerable—right now. As my colleague from Oklahoma knows, we are now vulnerable.

I do not know when that continuing resolution will pass. Every day that goes by, we are susceptible to a cyber attack. Who is going to answer for that when it occurs because we did not act here?

We also know that even if the CR were to pass, it is a couple of months. We need to have long-term certainty. That is what we have been hearing from all of the folks in the cyber security industry. That is why the Trump administration is saying we need to pass a 10-year extension, and we need to do it now. It is why Members in the House, both Democrats and Republicans—there is overwhelming support there. There is overwhelming support in this Chamber right now. I assume that if we had a vote today, it would be overwhelmingly passed.

Why do we risk the security of our country from cyber attacks? Why don't we pass commonsense legislation? That is what this Senate should do.

I know we have issues that we debate all the time, but when there is overwhelming support and the threats to our country are imminent, we should act. And when we don't act, we fail the American people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

VOTE ON CAO NOMINATION

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I know of no further debate on the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

If not, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Cao nomination?

Mr. LANKFORD. 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 bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ), and the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 539 Ex.]

YEAS—52

Banks	Cruz	Justice
Barrasso	Curtis	Kennedy
Blackburn	Daines	Lankford
Boozman	Ernst	Lee
Britt	Fischer	Lummis
Budd	Graham	Marshall
Capito	Grassley	McConnell
Cassidy	Hagerty	McCormick
Collins	Hawley	Moody
Cornyn	Hoeben	Moran
Cotton	Husted	Moreno
Cramer	Hyde-Smith	Mullin
Crapo	Johnson	Paul

Ricketts	Scott (SC)	Tuberville
Risch	Sheehy	Wicker
Rounds	Sullivan	Young
Schmitt	Thune	
Scott (FL)	Tillis	

NAYS—45

Alsobrooks	Hickenlooper	Peters
Baldwin	Hirono	Reed
Bennet	Kaine	Rosen
Blumenthal	Kelly	Sanders
Blunt Rochester	Kim	Schiff
Booker	King	Shaheen
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Slotkin
Coons	Luján	Smith
Cortez Masto	Markey	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Murkowski	Warnock
Fetterman	Murphy	Warren
Gallego	Murray	Welch
Hassan	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Heinrich	Padilla	Wyden

NOT VOTING—3

Gillibrand	Schatz	Schumer
------------	--------	---------

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BANKS). Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The senior 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, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Executive Calendar No. 2, S. Res. 412, an executive resolution authorizing the en bloc consideration in Executive Session of certain nominations on the Executive Calendar.

John Thune, Bernie Moreno, Mike Crapo, Chuck Grassley, Ashley Moody, Markwayne Mullin, John Barrasso, Pete Ricketts, Ted Budd, Bill Hagerty, John R. Curtis, David McCormick, Tim Scott of South Carolina, John Cornyn, Steve Daines, Eric Schmitt, Jon A. Husted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on Executive Calendar No. 2, S. Res. 412, an executive resolution authorizing the en bloc consideration in executive session of certain nominations on the Executive Calendar, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) is necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 53, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 540 Ex.]

YEAS—53

Banks	Boozman	Capito
Barrasso	Britt	Cassidy
Blackburn	Budd	Collins

Cornyn	Hyde-Smith	Paul
Cotton	Johnson	Ricketts
Cramer	Justice	Risch
Crapo	Kennedy	Rounds
Cruz	Lankford	Schmitt
Curtis	Lee	Scott (FL)
Daines	Lummis	Scott (SC)
Ernst	Marshall	Sheehy
Fischer	McConnell	Sullivan
Graham	McCormick	Thune
Grassley	Moody	Tillis
Hagerty	Moran	Tuberville
Hawley	Moreno	Wicker
Hoeben	Mullin	Young
Husted	Murkowski	

NAYS—46

Alsobrooks	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Baldwin	Hirono	Sanders
Bennet	Kaine	Schatz
Blumenthal	Kelly	Schiff
Blunt Rochester	Kim	Shaheen
Booker	King	Slotkin
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Smith
Coons	Luján	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Markey	Warner
Duckworth	Merkley	Warnock
Durbin	Murphy	Warren
Fetterman	Murray	Welch
Gallego	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Padilla	Wyden
Hassan	Peters	
Heinrich	Reed	

NOT VOTING—1

Schumer

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 53, the nays are 46. The motion was agreed to.

EN BLOC NOMINATIONS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

An executive resolution (S. Res. 412) authorizing the en bloc consideration in Executive Session of certain nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I rise to talk about the reality of the shutdown that we are in and the efforts underway to find a path out, which I am optimistic we can, particularly after discussions among so many colleagues of both parties today on the floor of the Senate.

This is the third time during my nearly 13 years in the Senate that I have been involved in a shutdown. The first occurred in the fall of 2013. I had been in the Senate for less than a year. Senator CRUZ sort of forced us into a shutdown mode over the Affordable Care Act. Interestingly enough, many years later, that Affordable Care Act is still central to this discussion. In late 2018 and 2019, President Trump forced us into a shutdown of part of the government—the part of government dealing with the Department of Justice and other justice-related Agencies—over border wall funding.

The first shutdown lasted for about 2 weeks. The second shutdown—again, of part of government, not all of government—lasted for about a month. And they are horrible. The consequences for those affected, whether they be Federal workers or the citizens who need services, are horrible.