

benefits in the Tax Code as anyone else. That is why we made it refundable—because we wanted to reward work and we wanted to help with the growth of that child and to deal with their challenges.

I agree with the Senator from New Hampshire that the anecdotal stories she included in her remarks amount to fraud, and they should be stopped. Let's be clear: The stories she told of claiming credits for children not in the United States or of 1,000 tax returns linked to 8 addresses, those actions are already illegal by whomever would make such a false filing and commit those actions.

In fact, what the Senator does is cite reports of IRS investigators who did their job shutting down illegal activity. It seems to me the IRS doesn't need her amendment to go after this fraud. They need the resources and the investigators to ultimately make sure all elements of the code that have fraudulent activity being taken need to be dealt with. They need Republicans to stop cutting their funds so they can do their job better. But to use these instances of fraud that were successfully pursued to go after American children is not confronting fraud. It is disadvantaging children—4 million children to be exact.

If we had one computer science company prosecuted for tax evasion, we don't bar all computer science companies from ever taking the research and development tax credit again. If we find one entity, one person or one industry committing fraud, we don't eliminate all of the benefits of the provision in the Tax Code for which they committed fraud because we have decided that provision is of a societal benefit. What we do is make sure we go after the individuals who commit the fraud. It doesn't make any sense, just like hammering 4 million U.S. children because of fraud perpetrated by some other unscrupulous actor doesn't make a whole lot of sense to me.

I believe this amendment creates a clear-cut case of priorities. Surely nobody here would argue that outside of this instance, there is no other part of the Tax Code that allows waste, fraud or abuse. We could sit down and find dozens of wasteful loopholes, fraudulent tax practices, and abusive tax shelters that could be shut down in order to pay for restoring the cuts to military pensions. If my Republican colleagues chose to support these efforts, I think this bill would sail through the Senate.

I say to my friends who are putting up obstacles—because I believe a lot of these false choices that are being put out there are not for the purposes of a legitimate policy goal but to undermine the efforts of achieving the extension of unemployment insurance—I say to them I think you need to stop and think. Think about the people who are hurting. Think about their lives, their hopes, and their struggles. Think about what their conversations are around

the kitchen table at night. Every night in New Jersey and all over the country thousands of families who have played by the rules and are looking for work are sitting around the table asking heartwrenching questions: How will we afford the mortgage and keep our home if we cannot get the assistance during this period of time? Do I have to decide between putting food on the table and keeping a place for my family? What if I have a health emergency? These are real-life conversations that are being had by Americans across this country.

How are we not putting aside ideology and looking into our conscience for the obvious answer? This is a simple extension of unemployment benefits for those who need our help. It is a no-brainer at a time when so many need help now and don't care about politics, don't want or deserve to be pawns in a political battle over the role or size of government. They just want help from the very people who represent them.

It isn't a time for political games. It is a time for action. We can always argue deficits. We can argue about debt management, we can argue about politics, but for now it is about the American people, their lives, their hopes, and their dreams for a better life for themselves and their families. It is about the kind of Nation we are and the values we hold dear.

Extending unemployment benefits isn't just the right thing to do morally, it also makes good economic sense. Study after study has shown that unemployment benefits are one of the most effective ways to help our economy grow, so much so that every \$1 spent produces a benefit of at least \$1.50 in gross domestic product. That is because people receiving benefits spend the money and immediately stimulate the economy in the form of consumer spending, which accounts for 70 percent of our GDP. Leaving 1.3 million Americans in the cold without any assistance would end up costing our economy 240,000 jobs.

Some on the other side say helping people who have been out of work is a crutch. I have to be honest with you. I have never met a person in my State who said they wanted to be on unemployment, who found dignity in being on unemployment or realized their dreams by being on unemployment. They found their dignity by achieving a job that helped them realize their hopes and dreams and aspirations.

The American worker is not lazy, and they don't want handouts. With the job market still recovering, there simply are not enough jobs available for them. As we work to make sure there is an economy that has enough jobs for Americans to be able to realize their hopes and dreams and aspirations, it is incumbent on us to make sure we continue to assist them so those stark choices around the kitchen table aren't as horrible as they are today.

I hope my colleagues will oppose hurting 4 million American children,

exacerbating the poverty in our country, and sending a message that goes counter to what the child tax credit is all about. We want to help an American child be able to fulfill their hopes and dreams and aspirations and their God-given potential. The adoption of the Ayotte amendment would go entirely counter to that belief.

With that, I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:36 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. BALDWIN).

EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION EXTENSION ACT—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 2:30 p.m. will be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders.

The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, I wish to share briefly a few thoughts about where we are. We have before us an unemployment bill and the pending business is the Reid amendment that would extend unemployment benefits for a full year, and none of it is paid for effectively. All of it violates the Budget Act. It is unthinkable that we would pass another \$17 billion that would add to the debt of the United States—every billion of it, every single dollar of it borrowed, much of it from people around the world who are not friendly to us. So this is not a good way for us to start.

It is subject to a budget point of order because it violates our spending limits and that has been confirmed. I know the Presiding Officer is a member of the Budget Committee. It has been confirmed by Senator MURRAY and her staff, the Democratic leadership on the Budget Committee, that it violates the budget. So that means if it is not fixed—and I understand there is some attempt going on at this time to maybe rewrite it in a way that actually has a legitimate pay-for, to provide assistance to those who are long-term unemployed but paid for without adding to the debt of the United States.

I will remind my colleagues that in December we passed the Murray-Ryan legislation which set limits on spending, and the President signed it into law just 2 weeks ago. As soon as we waltz into the U.S. Senate in January of this year, we have a piece of legislation that bursts the budget entirely. It is an utter violation of the spending agreements we agreed to. So I hope our colleagues can present something to us that would lay out an effective way to handle those who are unemployed and would also pay for the legislation. That is what we have to do.

This is how we go broke. This is what has happened. We made a promise when the legislation passed in December to cap spending and stay within that limit. That is the law that is being violated 1 month later, if this were to pass. Hopefully, it will not pass. I don't believe the House will pass legislation that adds another \$17 trillion to the debt and not add—I just don't think that is possible.

This is a process that is not healthy. I urge our colleagues to understand that if this legislation is not fixed—if the Reid amendment is not fixed and paid for—I intend to move to object to it, to raise a budget point of order. It will take 60 votes to override the budget we just agreed to. I don't believe 60 Members of this Senate will so vote.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANCHIN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, what is the issue before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to commit is the pending question.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I am going to offer a consent agreement based on the conversations I have had with a number of Republicans, and a long conversation with my caucus just a few minutes ago. I am going to speak for a few minutes because I know everybody has a lot to do, but we have all been working hard to find a way to extend unemployment insurance benefits for 1.4 million Americans who are struggling to get by.

We have a filibuster before us again—another one. First, Republicans complained they were filibustering these essential benefits because the extension was not paid for. So Senator REED of Rhode Island came forward with a pay-for amendment. Then Republicans complained, they were filibustering because they had not been able to offer amendments. So a proposal was made—and I am going to do that in a short time with a unanimous consent request—that would give each side a reasonable number of amendments—five, to be specific. Now Republicans say they want to have their amendments and have a cloture vote to pass the bill too.

Sounds as though Republicans want to, for lack of a better way to describe this, have their cake and eat it too. The question is, are Republicans filibustering unemployment insurance benefits or are they not?

If we have an amendment process, then what we should get in exchange is an up-or-down vote on the bill, and

that is what my consent agreement will call for. Republicans who don't like extending unemployment insurance benefits can still vote no on the bill, but we should at least be able to have a vote on the bill. But we can't set up a system where the minority of the Senate, which opposes unemployment insurance benefits, gets both an amendment process where they can offer these poison-pill amendments and then the minority of the Senate, again, that opposes the bill, can still kill the bill. This doesn't make a lot of sense.

I know everybody has worked hard to try to work through this process—to kind of thread the needle. I told a number of Republican Senators I met with a little while ago, as my Democratic Senators know, that we think there should be a new day in the Senate. We think we should start by whatever comes up next—whether it is flood insurance, unemployment compensation, whatever is next—by having a reasonable number of relevant amendments, and see if we, as Senators, can work our way through a bill doing that. If we can do that a few times, maybe we will get better and start having some non-relevant amendments, but at least let us start someplace so Senators here can have the experience of offering amendments—both us and the Republicans—and try to get some legislation passed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the cloture motions with respect to the Reed of Rhode Island amendment No. 2631 and S. 1845 be vitiated; that the motion to commit and amendment No. 2631 be withdrawn; that a substitute amendment, which is at the desk, be made pending; that there be up to five amendments related to the bill from each side in order to the substitute amendment; further, that each of these amendments be subject to a side-by-side amendment if the opposing side chooses to offer one; amendments under this agreement must be offered no later than 4 p.m. Wednesday, January 15; that no other amendments or motions to commit be in order; that no points of order be in order to the substitute or the underlying bill; that each amendment have up to 1 hour of debate equally divided; that upon the use or yielding back of time on each of the amendments offered, the Senate proceed to vote in relation to the amendments to the substitute in the order offered with any side-by-side amendment vote occurring prior to the amendment to which it was offered; that all of the amendments to the substitute be subject to a 60-affirmative-vote threshold; that upon disposition of the amendments, the bill be read a third time, as amended, if amended, and the Senate proceed to vote on passage of the bill; that if the bill is passed, the Senate immediately proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 192, H.R. 2009; that all after the enacting clause be stricken and the text of S. 1845, as passed by the Senate, be inserted in lieu thereof; that

the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed; that an amendment to the title be considered and agreed to; and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The minority leader.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, we have now been on this bill a week—a week. No amendments have been allowed. It is pretty clear the majority leader is not interested in having an open amendment process. And, of course, the consent request that has just been offered requires that all of the Republican amendments be at a 60-vote threshold and that final passage be at 51—in other words, guaranteed to fix the result in such a way that doesn't give the minority a fair chance.

I mean, who is to say, a number of our amendments might be appealing to Members on the Democratic side. That is probably why the majority leader wants it to be at 60, because he is afraid they may pass.

So this has obviously been fixed to guarantee that you get no outcome. Of course, our Members who voted to get on the bill, who are anxious to try to improve the bill and find a way to get us to final passage, have also found this agreement to be unacceptable. So I am not speaking just for myself but for the Members on my side who have spent a lot of time over the last week trying to figure a way to get this bill across the floor in a bipartisan fashion which would actually achieve the result and try to get us to some reforms as well.

So I ask unanimous consent that once the Senate resumes consideration of S. 1845, the unemployment extension bill, the first amendment in order be a Heller-Collins amendment related to the bill. I further ask unanimous consent that following the disposition of that amendment, it be in order for the majority leader, or his designee, to offer an amendment, and it be in order for the leaders or their designees to continue to offer amendments in an alternating fashion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we have seen in the last little bit a significant number of statements on the floor and op-ed pieces written about process—process.

On this side we have been talking about 1.4 million Americans needing help getting past the real financial crisis they find.

It seems interesting to me the only fix to get no outcome is the Republican strategy to find something to object to no matter what Democrats try. Process—compared to helping in a substantive way people who are in trouble,

process never wins. We need to move forward.

My friend talks about amendments. Democrats have amendments. We have 5 too. Ours would have a 60-vote threshold just like theirs. This is the new target that my Republican colleague the Republican leader has set. We have a new reality around here of 60 votes. This isn't anything I invented. In fact, I wish we would get rid of it and go back to the way we used to do it.

So I repeat. I think this has been constructive. I especially appreciate the junior Senator from Nevada and the senior Senator from Maine working to come up with something. I am disappointed we couldn't work something out. It appears, and I have been told, they are going to object to this consent agreement just as I object to modifying my consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I would like to ask the leader a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHUMER. Objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard to the Republican leader's request.

Is there objection to the majority leader's request?

Mr. McCONNELL. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, my friend from New York was standing to reserve the right to object.

Mr. SCHUMER. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Let me just say, I think on both sides of the aisle there is a real desire to try to work things out so we can have more debate, more discussion. It seems to me, from the years I have been here—not as long as either leader—there has always been sort of a way the place worked, particularly in the old days when it worked better: The majority sets the agenda. That is their right as majority. The minority has the right to offer amendments—both—amendments that might change that agenda and amendments that, frankly, might be tough to vote for so the minority can capture the majority again. That has been fair.

But it seems to me that what my friend the Republican leader is saying is: We want all the amendments we want, but we are still going to filibuster any bill you bring up. Maybe a few have said: If our amendments pass on the other side, maybe we won't filibuster. But that is not much of a fair deal.

So I would suggest that what the Democratic leader has suggested is eminently fair. It gives the minority—no matter who it is—their time-honored right to offer amendments, difficult amendments. That is part of the deal. But it gives the majority the

right to set the agenda and not have the things they bring forward filibustered ipso facto and not be allowed to come to a vote.

It is in fact true, as I understand it, that a couple of those who are offering amendments on the other side of the aisle have stated that if their amendment doesn't pass, they won't allow us to come to a vote.

So I hope we could proceed along the way the majority leader suggests and not to simply offer amendments—relevant, not relevant; germane, not germane—and then make it almost certain the bill will be filibustered and that we won't be able to get an up-or-down vote. All we are asking is an up-or-down vote on employment insurance.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, regular order.

Mr. SCHUMER. So I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader.

Mr. McCONNELL. I believe I objected to the majority leader's request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator did so.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to call up the Heller amendment No. 2651.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent to call up the Coburn amendment No. 2606.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. I object.

Mr. McCONNELL. Parliamentary inquiry: Is it correct that no Senator is permitted to offer an amendment to the unemployment insurance bill while the majority leader's motion to commit with instructions with further amendments is pending?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McCONNELL. Further parliamentary inquiry: If a motion to table the Reid motion to commit with a further amendment is successful, would there still be Reed amendments pending that would prevent anyone from offering an amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I have an important amendment that I would like the Senate to debate and vote on. The Reid motion to commit is currently blocking the consideration of those amendments.

In order for the Senate to start considering amendments, including the Coburn amendment No. 2606, I move to table the pending Reid motion to commit with instructions and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I do have a right to object to this; do I not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct, but the question is on

the cloture motion. It takes consent for the motion to be tabled.

Mr. REID. I am not objecting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The question is on the motion to table.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 55, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 8 Leg.]

YEAS—45

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

NAYS—55

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

The motion was rejected.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the next two votes be 10 minutes in duration.

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

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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 amendment No. 2631 to S. 1845, a bill to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes.

Harry Reid, Jack Reed, Martin Heinrich, Richard Blumenthal, Michael F. Bennet, Richard J. Durbin, Patty Murray, Max Baucus, Debbie Stabenow, Bill Nelson, Amy Klobuchar, Thomas R. Carper, Edward J. Markey, Benjamin L. Cardin, Sheldon Whitehouse, Charles E. Schumer, Patrick J. Leahy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on amendment No. 2631 to S. 1845, a bill to provide for the extension of certain unemployment

benefits, 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 assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 52, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 9 Leg.]

YEAS—52

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

NAYS—48

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 52, the nays are 48. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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. 1845, a bill to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes.

Harry Reid, Jack Reed, Amy Klobuchar, Elizabeth Warren, Richard J. Durbin, Sheldon Whitehouse, Edward J. Markey, Tammy Baldwin, Patrick J. Leahy, Christopher A. Coons, Barbara A. Mikulski, Patty Murray, Mark Warner, Mazie Hirono, Christopher Murphy, Tom Harkin, Sherrod Brown.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on S. 1845, a bill to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, 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 legislative clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 55, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 10 Leg.]

YEAS—55

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

NAYS—45

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 55, the nays are 45. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which cloture was not invoked on S. 1845.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is entered.

The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I appreciate very much my colleague, the junior Senator from Nevada, voting with us—voting with himself. He is a cosponsor of this legislation. He and JACK REED have done admirably good work for the Senate and for the country.

Everyone should notice on the first matter we tried to invoke cloture on, I did not enter a motion to reconsider. I would hope we could get that passed sometime. If we cannot, there is still an effort, I am sure, out there someplace where we could find a way to work together to get these people the desperate help they need. So that is why I did this, leaving the door open for us to work together to try to come up with something.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. I rise to express my extreme disappointment that the Senate has been blocked from moving forward on this critical legislation. There are about 1.5 million Americans who have lost their unemployment insurance since December 28. Every week 70,000 more lose that protection, so my disappointment is severe.

But their situation is much more desperate. We had within our power today

the ability to move this Senate forward to help our people, to help people who only qualified for the program because they worked and because they are still looking for work in one of the most difficult job markets we have seen in many decades.

It is extremely urgent that we act and today we failed to act. We have to continue to move forward. The majority leader has procedurally put us in a position so we can call up this measure again very quickly. We have to continue to work toward a solution. We have to keep the economy moving forward and creating jobs. That was what this was about, giving people some modest support each week. But also, as the CBO estimated, this measure, if extended for the full year, would generate 200,000 additional jobs. That is, on average, about what we have been creating each month. In fact, I will remind my colleagues, last year's unemployment insurance benefits were unpaid for and they generated additional jobs, not only providing benefits to people who needed it and were searching for work but increased economic activity in the country, which put people to work.

I hope my colleagues recognize this legislation they filibustered today was the result of significant concessions to many of my Republican colleagues. I worked closely with my Republican colleagues. We worked to find a way through this thicket so we could help Americans who have earned this help.

I think it is important to make clear how much we moved to try to accommodate the major objections and considerations of my colleagues on the other side.

We first proposed—and I proposed—this as emergency spending, unpaid for. We received from the other side: No, we can't accept that. It has to be paid for.

We went ahead, and the in the first proposal we voted on today, we paid for it. We also responded to another significant concern that we not use tax revenues to pay for it, so we avoided tax revenue.

Next, we went ahead and we adopted a provision to pay for it, to provide for many months, 11½ months of benefits, paid for without using revenues.

Let me also note that this is the exception to the rule. The White House, in some of their materials, has noted that "fourteen of the last 17 times in 20 years that it's been extended," UI, "there's been no strings attached," no pay-fors—emergency spending. But yet we listened to the thoughtful comments of our colleagues, we worked together closely with them, and we came up with a way to pay for this extension for 11½ months and not to use tax revenues, even though many on our side—in fact I would be among them—who would say there are egregious loopholes that should be closed regardless of what the revenue is used for but could be used to fund these benefits.

Then we have had this procedural back-and-forth. But today Leader REID offered a series of amendments to the

other side, and they objected to that offer.

Let me reiterate. We have tried, not only in very good faith but very diligently over the last several days particularly, to try to bring something to this floor that could get the 60 votes necessary to help these struggling Americans.

We have incorporated, in fact, in our pay-for, one of the provisions Senator PORTMAN suggested with respect to disability payments—which was controversial in some respects—but it was, again, another attempt to try to look at what my colleagues, on the Republican side as well as the Democratic side, were talking about in terms of how we would responsibly pay for this measure.

We have been debating this extension since December. It is time to act, and regrettably we did not act today. We have made concessions to try to move forward. This was not a take-it-or-leave-it. It has been unpaid for 14 times before—and it would have been 15 times now. We have to do this. And still we are telling people who are in very extreme economic situations, who are depending on this modest \$300 a week to help them pay their rent, pay their mortgage, put fuel in their car, have a cell phone so they can look for work, get to a job interview—telling them, no, you are still out in the cold, literally, and it is very cold in parts of the country.

We can't give up. We are not going to give up. I am very encouraged. After talking to some of my colleagues on the Republican side, they still want to work through this with us. We will accept that opportunity to work together.

Let us remember though what is a disappointing moment today for many of us is a dispiriting moment for millions of Americans who do not have the modest support unemployment insurance would provide. We have to work for them, we have to work for our economy, and we can do both. In the weeks ahead and the days ahead we will continue to do that.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MORAN. As we just heard, the Senate continues to discuss and consider an extension of unemployment benefits. Many Americans certainly do continue to struggle to find work in today's economy. While assistance to those without work serves an important purpose in helping Americans in transition, I am fearful we are failing—in fact, I know we are failing—to address the underlying and important root cause of that unemployment; that is, how do we as Americans grow our economy and create jobs for the citizens of our country?

A growing economy creates new opportunities for Americans to find meaningful work. With meaningful work comes the opportunity for Americans to improve their economic secu-

rity and advance up the economic ladder.

In 2012 Senator WYDEN and I started the Economic Mobility Caucus that met today for the fifth time, exploring ways we could work together to create the opportunity for every American to work their way up, have a better life, a greater future, more success, and better financial stability.

Unfortunately—again, at the moment, in my view—a lack of leadership and partisan politics have prevented action on measures that could provide an immediate boost to the economy at little or no cost to the American taxpayer.

Data from the Kauffman Foundation in Kansas City makes clear that most new jobs come from the young companies created by entrepreneurs. In fact, since 1980, nearly all of the net new jobs that have been created by companies are less than 5 years old. These new businesses create an average of 3 million jobs each year.

As of December, approximately 20.6 million Americans were unemployed, wanted to work but have stopped searching for a job or are working part time because they can't find full-time unemployment. When we talk about the unemployment rate, it masks the true story of people who have given up looking for a job as well as those who have a part-time job and need and desire a full-time job.

The labor force participation rate has reached its lowest level in 35 years. At a time when only 62 percent of working-age Americans are employed, it is clear we need an economic boost powered by entrepreneurship. To jumpstart the economy and create jobs for Americans, we have put together and I authored bipartisan legislation called Startup Act 3.0.

The Senate majority leader is often talking about the need for allowing votes on legislation that has bipartisan support, and this is a perfect example of such a bill that ought to be considered by the Senate.

Working with Senator WARNER—my primary cosponsor of this bill—and Senators COONS, KAINE, KLOBUCHAR, as well as Republican Senators BLUNT and RUBIO, we introduced commonsense legislation that addresses four key factors that influence an entrepreneur's chance for success: taxes, regulations, innovation, and access to talent.

It has become all too common in the Senate that we are denied the opportunity to have a vote on things that many of us find common agreement on, and Startup Act 3.0 is one of those. In fact, I offered, along with Senator WARNER, Startup Act 3.0 as an amendment to the unemployment insurance extension bill. Startup Act 3.0 makes commonsense changes to the Tax Code to encourage investment in startups and reward patient capital. To address the burdensome government regulations, the legislation requires Federal agencies to determine whether the cost of new regulations outweigh the bene-

fits—and encourages Federal agencies to give special consideration to the impact proposed regulations would have upon those startup businesses.

As any entrepreneur knows, a good idea is essential to starting a successful business. To get more ideas out of the laboratory and into the market, this legislation improves the process for commercializing federally funded research so taxpayer-funded innovations can be turned into companies and spur economic growth and job creation.

Finally, Startup Act 3.0 provides new opportunities for highly educated and entrepreneurial immigrants to stay in the United States. They are here legally now but are often told they need to go home to pursue their careers, when we know their talent and their new ideas could fuel economic growth and create American jobs.

While there is meaningful disagreement—we have plenty of disagreement about the immigration issue—there are aspects of immigration in which there is broad agreement. One of the areas of agreement is highly skilled immigration. Highly skilled immigrants not only provide the talent for growing companies needed to fuel further growth and job creation, but those individuals tend to be very entrepreneurial.

Immigrants are now more than twice as likely as native-born Americans to start a business. In 2011 immigrants were responsible for more than one in every four U.S. business founded.

In addition, immigrants are responsible for significant contributions to innovation. According to a recent study by the Partnership for a New American Economy, 76 percent of patents at the top 10 patent-producing U.S. universities had at least one foreign-born inventor.

One of the best things we can do for the American economy is to welcome highly skilled and entrepreneurial immigrants. No matter what Congress does, these individuals will continue to innovate and create jobs. The question is where will they innovate and where will the jobs be created. If Congress makes the right choice, those jobs and that innovation will occur in the United States of America and build the U.S. economy and employ U.S. citizens.

Unfortunately, there are too many people in the Senate and in the Congress in Washington, DC, who say we can't do anything unless we do everything. That has prevented the passage of targeted immigration legislation that would boost the economic growth and create American jobs. That same attitude prevents us from doing many things on the Senate floor, and it is well past time we found ways to do the things we can agree upon and not wait for the opportunity to do everything. Let's do the things we can while we wait and work on the chance to do bigger and broader things.

The STEM visas we talk about seem so important to our economy. American businesses are projected to need

an estimated 800,000 workers with advanced STEM degrees by 2018 but will only find 550,000 American graduates with an advanced STEM education.

We must do more as a nation. We absolutely must do more to prepare Americans for careers in STEM fields so that our country no longer has to rely upon talented foreign labor. But in the short term, as we work to equip Americans with skills for the 21st-century economy, we need to create a pathway for highly educated foreign-born students who are here in the United States legally, going to school, to stay in America where their ideas and talents can fuel great American economic growth.

Startup 3.0 creates visas for foreign students who graduate from an American university with a master's or Ph.D. in science, technology, engineering, or mathematics. These skilled workers would be granted conditional status contingent upon them filling a needed gap in the U.S. workforce.

It may seem counterintuitive that by allowing highly skilled workers to work in the United States, more Americans will find work, but that is exactly what will happen. A study by the Partnership for a New American Economy and the American Enterprise Institute found that every immigrant with a graduate degree in the United States from a U.S. university working in a STEM field creates 2.62 subsequent American jobs.

If American companies are unable to find and hire the qualified, talented workers they need, those businesses will open locations overseas. I have seen examples of that too many times. When this happens, not only are those specific jobs gone—they are lost—but also the many supporting jobs and economic activities associated with them are no longer here.

Even more frustrating to me is that when these highly skilled workers who are now employed in some other country and who are entrepreneurs too have an idea and they found and start a business that may grow and create more jobs because they couldn't find employment here due to lacking the necessary visa and have moved to another country, they use their entrepreneurial skills and talent, and they create the jobs—the company—elsewhere. So the jobs we need in this country are then outside the United States.

This legislation also allows for an entrepreneur's visa. Immigrants to the United States have a long history of creating businesses in America. Today, 1 in every 10 Americans employed at a privately owned U.S. company works at an immigrant-owned firm. Of the current Fortune 500 companies, more than 40 percent were founded by a first- or second-generation American.

So my question to my colleagues is, Why would we want to leave an immigration system in place that discourages entrepreneurs from coming to our country, investing their own money, and creating jobs here and strength-

ening our economy? I think we should do exactly the opposite and welcome those people who want to create jobs for Americans in America.

Startup 3.0 creates an entrepreneur's visa for foreign-born entrepreneurs currently in the United States legally. Those individuals with a good idea, with capital, and a willingness to hire American workers would be able to stay in the United States and grow their businesses here. Each immigrant entrepreneur would be required to create jobs for Americans. If the business is not successful and jobs are not created, the immigrant would have to go back to his or her home country.

Using conservative estimates, the Kauffman Foundation predicts that the entrepreneur's visa would generate 500,000 to 1.6 million jobs over the next 10 years. These are real jobs with real economic impact that could boost GDP, it is estimated, by more than 1.5 percent. These are jobs for Americans desperately seeking to work here to support their families and follow their dreams.

As the Senate considers extending unemployment insurance in the short term, we must not lose sight of the long-term goal—that ought to be the short-term, intermediate, and long-term goal—of creating an environment for jobs in America. There is no better way to create jobs than to support entrepreneurs and to foster the development of new businesses, which are responsible for all those net new jobs in the economy.

Numerous studies demonstrate that a smarter more strategic immigration policy that supports entrepreneurs and skilled immigrants can grow the economy and help put Americans back to work. Jobless Americans and U.S. businesses searching for the talent they need to expand and create jobs can no longer afford to let the all-or-nothing approach to immigration legislation hold economic growth and opportunity hostage. It has prevented progress on important challenges facing our country for far too long. A far better approach would be to pass the things we can agree upon now and keep working to find agreement on the issues that divide us. First on this list should be the measures outlined in Startup Act 3.0.

Other countries are realizing the value of highly educated and entrepreneurial individuals in starting businesses, and they are changing their laws to welcome them. The United States cannot afford to turn a blind eye to global competition. If we fail to act, we risk losing the next generation of great entrepreneurs, and the jobs they will create will be in foreign countries, not in the United States, and we risk continuing another month in which 20.6 million Americans remain without meaningful work.

Work is an ennobling feature of life. Jobs matter, and this Congress and this President have failed miserably, in my view, to carry out one of our primary responsibilities—to create an environ-

ment in which Americans can find work and can pursue that American dream of putting food on their family's table, saving for their kids' education, making sure they have a secure retirement in the future, and knowing every day when they get up and go to work they are doing something good for themselves and for their families and their country.

Mr. President, we desperately need to work together to create an environment in which American jobs are created. No one I know really wants to be the recipient of an unemployment check. It may be necessary, but it is not their goal. The goal is to find an ennobling, meaningful job that supports them and their family.

I thank the Chair for his indulgence. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. I think it is wonderful to hear the Republican Senator Mr. MORAN talk about job creation. It is really music to my ears, especially when he talks about addressing the importance of immigration, which clearly needs to be addressed and is clearly a job-creation issue. That is why I have been hoping Speaker BOEHNER would take up the Senate's immigration bill, which is comprehensive; and, as President Obama said, if you can't do that, bring up a series of bills and let's get moving.

Believe me, I have seen every report there is, and Senator MORAN is right—immigration reform is necessary for us. It is an economic issue. It would be an economic boon to our country in terms of jobs and GDP.

I also think it very important that we not turn our backs on an American value we have had in this country since the 1950s in which Republicans and Democrats in the Congress and Republicans and Democrats in the White House have agreed that when there is a great recession and people are out of work, they need to have unemployment compensation, which is an insurance program to keep them from falling apart. This is an American value.

We talk about bipartisanship, but sometimes we just can't seem to get there. I have looked back, and since the 1950s, two-thirds of the time we passed an extension of unemployment compensation—many times to help people the Chair has worked so hard to represent, the mine workers and others who were hit with hard times, we did so in a bipartisan way—and two-thirds of the time with no pay-for. Since 1958, two-thirds of the time we extended it with no pay-for.

Under George W. Bush we extended unemployment compensation—the extended unemployment compensation paid for by the Federal Government—three times with no pay-for because it was an emergency. And we did it even though in those days deficits were raging.

Here we have cut the deficit in half, and we don't like that. We want to cut it more. I want to see it balanced. But

we surely should do what we just tried to do, which is to extend unemployment compensation for a long period of time with a pay-for—that is what we tried to do—or for a short period of time without a pay-for and help people keep their lives together.

We have had this American value since the 1950s. Yet, for the first time I can tell, we had one party—with the exception of one person—vote lockstep against extending unemployment compensation to hard-working Americans who are looking for work every week, every day. And I have their stories, which I am going to put in the RECORD. They have turned their backs on 1.5 million Americans—in my State, 250,000 people.

Now, here is the thing—and I don't like to come and make these speeches, but the facts speak for themselves. Leader REID, the majority leader, just offered a very important deal in broad daylight to the Republicans. And I am going to make a parliamentary inquiry, if I might, Mr. President.

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

Mrs. BOXER. Here it is. Is it true that Majority Leader REID offered the Republicans five related amendments to the unemployment compensation bill, those amendments to be of their own choosing? Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mrs. BOXER. Is it further true that he offered Democrats five related amendments of their own choosing?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mrs. BOXER. Is it further correct that he also said each side could offer an additional five amendments as side-by-sides, if they wanted to, of their own choosing? Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mrs. BOXER. Is it also true that he offered time agreements of 1 hour per amendment and then to be followed by passage of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mrs. BOXER. OK. The reason I wanted to put this in the record in a simple way is because sometimes when we have the back-and-forth and the "I object" and "reserving the right to object," people lose track of exactly what happened.

We offered the Republicans everything they said they wanted. They wanted amendments. They were offered amendments of their own choosing. Up to 20 amendments could have been voted on under the agreement. They said they wanted pay-fors. We gave them a pay-for that actually came out of PAUL RYAN's budget, a structural change that would have paid for 10½ months of unemployment benefits. The Republicans just can't say yes. They demanded amendments. We gave them amendments. They demanded pay-fors. We gave them pay-fors.

I believe something else is going on, and I have to say what I think is going

on. They do not want to extend unemployment compensation to the long-term unemployed. That is a dramatic change that is occurring in the culture of this country, in the compassion of this country, in the consensus in this country, in the values of this country. We are talking about 1.5 million Americans—250,000 Californians. I am frankly stunned.

I know Senator MIKULSKI is here, and I so much want to hear from her, so I will skip some of the other history about how it has been over the years and how we have done this where we have come together, Republicans and Democrats. We have extended unemployment compensation benefits more times under Republican Presidents than under Democratic Presidents, and Democrats didn't stand there and say: Gee, there is a Republican in the White House. Maybe this will help him look good or maybe this will add two-tenths of 1 percent to the GDP. Maybe we better say no.

No. We said yes because we are a party that believes people need to keep hearth and home together.

The long-term unemployment rate is twice as high as it was at any other time when these extended benefits were allowed to expire. There are almost three unemployed people for every job opening nationwide.

I am going to close with a few little stories from my constituents because one has to hear the voices of people. In this Senate, we should be representing the middle class and the working poor of this country. We should be fighting for them because, guess what, everyone else benefits. The billionaires and millionaires are doing fine. They do better when we have a strong middle class.

The Presiding Officer is a fighter for economic justice, and I know this statistic is something the Senator has probably used many times. But the fact is that 450 families are worth more than 150 million Americans. I can guarantee you, those 450 families are just fine and their children and their grandchildren and their children's children's children. And good for them. Fine. But what about the people who are now cut off at the knees because they are not getting \$300 a week to live? Here is one of them. One woman wrote to me:

I am 58 years old and am receiving unemployment benefits for the first time in my life. I am currently receiving my first federal extension.

Which, by the way, she has now been cut off from.

I was laid off because the non-profit I was working for lost a major portion of its state funding.

Getting unemployment benefits is not preventing me from looking for work. In fact, people getting extended unemployment benefits are required to prove that they're looking for work. I spend hours every week filling out applications and posting my resume without results.

And then she says to me:

Tell me, how am I, and thousands like me supposed to pay rent and eat? I agree that Washington should "focus on job creation"

but that should be in addition to, not instead of, extending benefits. I beg you, please extend unemployment benefits.

Then there is Kaitlyn Smith of Twentynine Palms. She lost her benefit when the Federal extension expired. A Marine Corps veteran and the mother of two, Smith says: Work is hard to come by. They can't move because her husband, a vet of the Afghanistan-Iraq wars, must remain near the combat center until he is discharged in July.

Listen to this:

I have to keep the house at 55 degrees even though I have two little girls, ages 2½ and 1½.

That is what she told the L.A. Times in December.

How do my Republican friends—except for the one who voted with us at the end of the day—look themselves in the mirror and think about this courageous woman whose family put their life on the line for the country and who is freezing in their home, because they are playing parliamentary games on process?

Last, Cindy Snow of Beaumont:

Why are they using us as pawns? They're playing games with people's lives.

Referring to politicians in Washington. That appeared in Bloomberg News.

Laura Walker, a 63-year-old paralegal, has been looking for work since January, when she was laid off from a California law firm. She counted on \$450 a week in federal unemployment benefits for help that have now run out.

"Not all of us have savings and a lot of us have to take care of family because of what happened in the economy," said Walker, of Santa Clarita, who said she has applied for a least three jobs a week and shares an apartment with her unemployed son, his wife and two children. "It's going to put my family and me out on the streets."

That is from the Bloomberg News of December 30, 2013

Cindy Snow, of Beaumont, CA, lost her job as a social worker in April when the San Bernardino school system terminated the child-care program where she worked. Her husband, employed in the construction industry, has been without a job since 2009. They have been relying on assistance from the California Housing Finance Agency to cover a \$1,424-a-month payment on their home.

When she loses her unemployment benefits, she said, the family will no longer qualify for the housing assistance. "Why are they using us as pawns? They're playing games with people's lives," Snow said, referring to politicians in Washington.

This is also from Bloomberg News of December 30, 2013

Ethelyn Holmes, a software engineer who lives in Mission Hills, is one of 18,720 San Diego County residents about to lose the weekly payments. Holmes said her \$450 weekly unemployment payment goes to food, dental insurance and other living necessities.

Holmes, in her 40s, said she's tried zealously to find work. She's joined the Project Management Institute of San Diego, volunteered, attended meetings, cold called and written letters. Now, she said she'd like to find a retraining program to help her become more marketable. "... I have not been sitting here watching soap operas," she said. "I would go to work tomorrow, or today. I really am tired of this."

That is from the San Diego Union-Tribune dated December 28, 2013.

Steven Swanson of Madera Ranchos, CA, worked for 33 years in wholesale, mostly in beverage sales, before losing his job in 2011. Since then, he estimates that he's submitted resumes for more than 500 positions and in the last six months filled out more than 200 job applications—all to no avail.

"I want a job, I want to work," said Swanson whose daughter and son-in-law live with him and pay rent to help him keep up the mortgage on the house he owns. "As a taxpayer, I paid into the system for a lot of years. For them to just shut it off and say, 'These people need to get weaned off and get a job'—well, yeah, I need to get a job. But for them to suggest that I just go get welfare or go get food stamps—that's why I'm frustrated with the Republican Party. They just don't get it."

That is from the Fresno Bee of January 2, 2014.

In addition to helping people get by while they look for jobs, extending unemployment insurance will help the economy.

A new study by the Council of Economic Advisers and the U.S. Department of Labor estimates that extending unemployment insurance will prevent the loss of 240,000 jobs in 2014, including 46,441 in California.

CBO has said that another year-long extension would add two-tenths of a percent to our GDP.

CBO has found that when unemployment is high, extending unemployment insurance is one of the most cost-effective ways to grow the economy and create jobs.

This will help us reduce our deficit in the long term. Already, our annual deficit has been cut in half. For 2009, when President Obama took office, it was \$1.4 trillion. For 2013 it was \$680 billion, and for 2014 the forecast is only \$560 billion.

We are making progress, and extending unemployment benefits will help us grow our GDP and reduce our deficit even more.

So I say to my colleagues, the answer is obvious. Stop blocking this bill. It will save jobs, grow the economy, and provide help to our families while they get on their feet.

There are a lot of games played around here, and sometimes it is time to call the bluff of the people who are playing cruel games. Leader REID called the bluff of my friends on the other side. He said: You want amendments? You got them. You want to pay for this extension? We have done it. What did they do? They walked away. And who is suffering? People like the people I just told you about, ordinary folks who want nothing more than to get a decent job, who are caught in a situation where we are recovering from the worst recession since the Great Depression. And this is what we give them, a bunch of gobbledygook about: I wanted more of my amendments so I can be proud and offer amendments.

There is a time and a place for filibusters, even though they do far too many. There is a time and a place to

argue about process. This is not the time. This is not the place. This is wrong. I applaud Leader REID for his leadership. I applaud JACK REED for his leadership.

Before Senator MIKULSKI takes the microphone, I wish to thank her publicly. What a hard job she had to sit down and negotiate an appropriations bill, an omnibus bill which covers everything we do. It was so hard. But she did it in the right spirit of bipartisanship. So did her colleague, whom she dealt with and had to deal with, Congressman ROGERS. As a result, we are going to do something good here and give stability to the American people.

Why can't that same spirit of cooperation take over when we have offered the Republicans everything they wanted in order to get them to vote for unemployment compensation? I am distressed about it, and we will keep fighting on this issue.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. WARREN). The Senator from Maryland.

CONSOLIDATED APPROPRIATIONS ACT OF 2014

Ms. MIKULSKI, Madam President, I rise today to speak on the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2014. But before I make those comments, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from California Mrs. BOXER and also the Senator from Rhode Island Mr. JACK REED and also all of those who voted to move forward where we continue to provide an economic safety net for those people who have lost their job and are actively looking for work, and to continue this economic and social contract which has been part of the way Americans respond to help other Americans at a time when they are down but they shouldn't feel as though they are out. I hope we could put party rancor aside and look at commonsense ways to move this bill forward.

In terms of the so-called pay-fors, I have been here a long time. I have never seen this pay-for before on unemployment compensation, particularly for a 90-day bill. We are talking about 90 days, and we are already in the middle of January. I hope the two leaders can come together and we can resolve this.

On another topic, I wish to report to the Senate some very good news. I rise today as the chair of the Appropriations Committee, and I wish to announce that the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2014 has completed all its work in the committee process. We have completed our conference and it has been filed in the House and should be considered in the House and Senate this week. What does that mean?

First of all, our Appropriations Committee has met the test of the Constitution. Article 1, section 9 of the Constitution directs that there be an Appropriations Committee, although it is not referred to by name, and that every year we review the annual spending of the Federal Government and vote upon it.

We also followed the law. By following the law, the law is the bipartisan Budget Act forged by Chairpersons RYAN and MURRAY. We meet the requirements of the Budget Control Act.

The Budget Control Act looks at total spending for the Federal Government—mandatory spending and then discretionary spending. We who are appropriators handle all of the accounts for discretionary spending. Guess what. The Budget Committee puts a cap on us, and that is great. It is a way that we actually have a cap on spending that everybody knows and everybody voted for.

So we have a cap by law on discretionary spending of \$1.012 trillion for fiscal year 2014. The work of our 12 committees stayed within that cap, and yet we spent the money to meet certain areas. We met compelling needs. We certainly preserved national security. We looked out for our human capital, particularly our children in terms of education, and also invested in physical capital—improving infrastructure—and also the long-range needs of our country by putting public investments into important research and development by \$1 billion more in NIH.

We also met the mandate of the American people who told us: Work together. Be bipartisan. Work across the aisle and work across the dome. And we did it. They also said: When the bill comes up, don't do it with brinkmanship and don't do it with showmanship. Get the job done in a commonsense way which promotes growth in our country but yet at the same time looks at reducing debt.

They said: Don't do showdown politics. And we won't. We will pass it because we have met our deadline.

They said: Don't put government on autopilot with something called those continuing funding resolutions. We don't do that either. Every one of our 12 subcommittees is in this comprehensive bill.

We dealt with difficult and divisive policy issues, but we did it with diligence and determination. And, I must add, we tried to promote an atmosphere of civility as we did it. It was tense and it was intense. But at the end of the day, we did work pinpointing how to do the job rather than finger-pointing at each other. As I said, negotiations were conducted that way.

Our House Appropriations Committee chairman—Mr. HAL ROGERS, the gentleman from Kentucky—and I forged this agreement, along with ranking members, my vice chairman Senator SHELBY of Alabama and in the House Congresswoman LOWEY of New York. We didn't do it alone. There was bipartisan agreement of all the subcommittee chairs and over 50 Members of the House and the Senate.

We met a very stringent deadline. When we left here on December 20, we had to produce a bill by January 15. That is tomorrow. That is when the

continuing resolution expires. We are asking for a 72-hour extension, not to finish the job, but so we can do our deliberations on the floor in both the House and the Senate.

We worked day and night. I jokingly said during the deliberations: I wish I were as thin as I am stretched, because we really worked at it. Over the holidays our staffs and our subcommittee chairmen worked. The only time they took off was Christmas Eve and Christmas Day. So we thank each and every one of them for their dedication.

As I said, this bill required very difficult choices. It meant give and take. It meant more giving on both sides, because there were no big takes.

We worked under a very tight budget, \$1 trillion. It sounds like a lot of money, and it is. But of the \$1 trillion, \$600 billion was in the Department of Defense. The other \$300 billion was in discretionary spending for all of the domestic agencies. It comes out to like 620 and 380, but those are the rough numbers.

So we did meet our national security needs, but we also were very mindful. I was particularly mindful of the social contract with the American people. I wanted to have a bill to help create jobs in this country, not make-work but real work, in rebuilding our physical infrastructure on roads and bridges and clean water. I also wanted to look ahead to the long-range needs of our country, in research and discoveries, and not only win the Nobel prizes but win the markets. We expanded our commercial service office to help us promote exports overseas, accelerating manufacturing institutes where government could work with this new emerging dynamic, small-scale manufacturing. I have lost over 12 percent of manufacturing in my State, so manufacturing is important.

We wanted to make sure that families felt they had a government that is on their side—first of all, helping with school safety—and we have a bipartisan program in here to promote school safety—but at the same time to promote quality childcare and early childhood education. We then made those kinds of investments, all with an eye to getting value for taxpayers.

Our colleagues were very clear, and so were the American people: We have to have a more frugal eye. I instructed my colleagues on the Senate side: Let's look at those programs which are dated, duplicative, or dysfunctional. They get a D: dated, duplicative, and dysfunctional. We were able to eliminate many of them, and we will be back at it next year doing a scrub. If you notice, there is no atmosphere of crisis.

The other thing that I am proud of in this bill is that we avoided contentious policy riders. I think we have been able to deal with those in a way where they would not be a problem for the other side of the aisle.

However, there was one item wrong or one technical mistake in the Budget

Committee that I am proud that we were able to fix. This was really at the very top of our agenda, when Mr. ROGERS and I met. We were deeply concerned about the cost-of-living issue related to military retirees of working age who were disabled or survivors. Their COLAs were mistakenly reduced by 1 percent in the recent budget agreement. This bill, the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2014, fixes that problem.

It is limited in scope. It is limited to disabled military retirees and survivors of departed servicemembers—the neediest of the needy. We hope, as time moves on, there is a Presidential and DOD commission on pension reform at DOD, and we will have a comprehensive approach and do it. But I want our colleagues to know we were very mindful of these veterans. So we did this fix for military retirees of working age who were disabled or survivors of departed servicemembers, but we also did something else.

If you go to the Web site in the House, which has the most detail because it is pending there—it will come up in the Senate when it moves here tomorrow—we really put money into veterans health care. We put money into fixing the veterans disability backlog. I know the Senator from Massachusetts believes that when you are on the front lines you should not have to wait at the back of the line if you are a wounded warrior to get your disability benefits determined. So we pushed for those reforms, and we put the taxpayers' dollars behind them because we knew that is the way they would want us to spend their money.

We also maintained the veterans education budget because many of our young men and women coming back home who served so well over there need to brush up on education here to move them to jobs here.

I hope in voting for this bill people realize it is a vote to support our most vulnerable patriots, to make sure we keep our promises to our veterans, and that we also look at the comprehensive bill that we have moved ahead without rancor, without roar, and we stayed within the budget parameters given to us on a bipartisan agreement.

The House will consider this agreement this week. They have sent us over a 3-day extension so we could complete our work. I hope we pass it. I would like it to pass tonight or certainly tomorrow. We will be on the floor for ample debate on this bill, and I look forward to answering some questions.

But at the end of the day, when all is said and done—in this institution often more is said rather than done—you will know we did get it done. I will have more to say about it when the bill comes to the floor.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Madam President, I thank my colleagues from Minnesota and North Dakota who are on the floor.

I know they want to enter into a colloquy, but they have been gracious to allow me 1 minute on a separate subject, which is flood insurance. I thank them so much.

Before I start, I congratulate the Chair of the Appropriations Committee, who not only understands the issues in a major piece of legislation, from science to space to technology to defense to homeland security to education, and really keeps so much of that in her mind and her heart, but she also can explain this important bill to us in a way that everyone can understand.

The Senator from Maryland is truly a champion and a treasure in the Senate. Before she leaves the floor I want to acknowledge her extraordinary leadership. It is a very tough time to find common ground, but she has found it with her Republican colleagues. I hope we can get this bill through the floor of the Senate in the next 2 or 3 days.

Let me say for one moment how important it is to pass this extraordinary appropriations bill, which many of us have been working on for over a year, literally, in public hearings and meetings, negotiating with our Republican colleagues. Of course, in the last month these high-level negotiations have been going on. We hope to be on that bill sometime tomorrow. Leader REID has expressed that we will not be leaving for the break next week without getting that work done.

I am prepared—all of us are here—to handle that business. But there is another piece of legislation of which, Madam President, you have been a cosponsor, and Senator HOEVEN, who is on the floor, has been an extraordinary leader on, and that is to fix our well-intended but disastrous flood insurance program referred to as Biggert-Waters, which was passed a year ago with very good intentions, but it has had disastrous consequences in Massachusetts, South Dakota, Louisiana, Texas, Montana, and in Pennsylvania.

This is not a coastal issue. This is an issue that affects millions of Americans owning their own homes, their primary homes, and business owners—solidly middle-class people who do not live anywhere near a beach and people whose homes have never flooded.

They found themselves, because of the unintended consequences of this well-intentioned law, in a terrible circumstance in which they may actually lose their home and lose their business. We can fix that. The great news is we have a bill that is being led by Senator MENENDEZ from New Jersey and Senator ISAKSON from Georgia. It is truly bipartisan. We have almost 30 cosponsors in the Senate. While it has been difficult to find common ground, we have worked very hard to find it. I am here on the floor to say to our knowledge we have pretty much worked out most of the objections on all sides.

We think there might be amendments that are wanted to be offered by Senator TOOMEY, Senator COBURN, Senator CRAPO, and on our side Senator

HAGAN and Senator MERKLEY. We are working through that now.

The amendment of Senator BLUNT we believe can be incorporated into the bill. The amendment of Senator TESTER can be incorporated into the base of the bill with no harm to the underlying balance of the bill.

I come to the floor to say to everyone, we are really making progress. We could work on these few amendments in the next hour, and the leaders might be able to ask unanimous consent for us to get on this bill in the morning and actually finish it before we go on appropriations. If everyone will cooperate just a little bit more on this, we could have several amendments and limit the time to 30 minutes of debate on each amendment. We would end up with about 6 or so amendments, and we could fit this into tomorrow morning's work.

That is my hope. If we do not, then we are going to have to stay here, I think, even after the appropriations bill to get this. I don't know about you, Madam Chair, but I just cannot go home again without getting this fixed. We have been working on this patiently. We have had hearings. We have had meetings. We have had press conferences. We have a coalition of over 200 organizations.

We have worked with the House in strong partnership. They will be ready to act when they get back on our bill. If we can get a strong vote of 70 Senators—which we are hoping for, maybe more—that will send a very strong signal to the House of Representatives. This bill has no score—a zero cost to this bill, zero. It doesn't repeal Biggert-Waters, it postpones it until we can fix it, and it gives us the impetus to fix it.

Let's work hard in the next hour or so. I really thank Senator ISAKSON for working so hard—the Senator from Georgia—for trying to clear the objections that are on his side, and Senator MENENDEZ and his staff for working on our side.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Louisiana for her work on the flood insurance bill. I am pleased to join her in that effort. It is very important. I hope we do have an opportunity to address that this week. We will continue to do all we can to help in that endeavor. Again, I thank her for all her work on that very important legislation.

(The remarks of Mr. HOEVEN and Ms. KLOBUCHAR pertaining to the introduction of S. 1925 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. HOEVEN. Madam President, 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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

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

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

OMNIBUS SPENDING PACKAGE

Mr. LEE. Madam President, I stand before this body today to talk about the omnibus spending package the Senate will be considering over the next few days. I have some concerns related to this omnibus spending package that relate to a program called PILT. It is an acronym with which most Americans and probably even most Members of Congress are not familiar. It stands for payment in lieu of taxes.

The program was developed to help those States, including my home State of Utah, in which the vast majority of the land is owned by the Federal Government. Beside me is a map of the United States. In red we can see all of the land that is owned by the Federal Government. As we can see by looking at the map, most of the land west of the Rocky Mountains—more than 50 percent, in fact—is owned by the Federal Government. Very little of the land east of the Rocky Mountains is, by contrast, owned by the Federal Government.

Being from a public land State presents some interesting, very significant, very substantial challenges. Among those challenges is the fact that the Federal Government has deemed this land, has legislated this land as being beyond the ability, beyond the authority of States and their political subdivisions—including counties and local taxing jurisdictions—beyond the ability of the States and their subdivisions to tax. So we can't collect property tax revenue from any of that land. As a result, a lot of our communities in public land States are impoverished—at least impoverished relative to what they might otherwise face. They are impoverished relative to what their ability would be to collect revenue through property taxes in public land States.

For that reason, this PILT Program was created to try to offset—at least to some degree—the heavy cost, the disproportionate burden that is placed on the shoulders of public land States and communities.

So each year Congress funds this program, and that program then partially offsets the lack of property tax revenue flowing through these public land States and communities.

Here is the problem I wish to focus on today: The omnibus spending package we are considering this week contains no funding for PILT—no funding whatsoever. This is potentially devastating to public land States, including Utah, Wyoming, Alaska, Montana, and many other States, especially those throughout the West. The problem is that America's public land States and counties can't wait any longer. This program must be funded, and it must be funded in this bill.

Here is a letter from a commissioner in Piute County, UT. This commissioner states:

PILT not being funded in 2014 will have a devastating impact on all counties in the West, but it is particularly devastating to a county the size of Piute. With 74 percent of Piute County under Federal control, \$225,000 of our \$1 million budget—almost one-fourth—comes in the form of PILT payments from the Federal Government. Without this funding, we will be in the midst of one of the biggest disasters to hit Piute County in years.

We have been scraping and scraping to try to figure out how to fund a fourth deputy sheriff in our county and thought we had it figured out until this \$225,000 evaporated from our county's revenue.

At the present time it is virtually impossible to staff all of the police, search and rescue, and emergency services we need. With this cut, it will be impossible.

The Piute County commissioner continues:

We will be forced to abandon services, including all services on public lands. It will be sad to have our public lands left without police, search and rescue, and emergency services. I think it is critical to understand that the loss of PILT funding cuts clear to the bone and will be devastating to counties such as Piute.

Now, some argue—some insist when faced with arguments such as these—that this is all OK and we can just wait to make PILT funding available, that we will make it available through another legislative vehicle we will supposedly pass later this year. In fact, some of these same people maintain that we will make it better, we will make it automatic, we will make it mandatory spending when we actually do this later this year.

It is true that between 2008 and 2013 PILT was funded through a mandatory spending mechanism. That has now expired. But it is important to remember that there is nothing mutually exclusive about these ideas; no reason why we can't go ahead and fund PILT now with discretionary spending and then adopt something later to restore the mandatory nature of funding for PILT. We can fund PILT now in this bill, and then we can make it mandatory later. We can and we should. This would give States and counties the certainty they need, the certainty they have been waiting for, the certainty that will allow them, finally, to plan their budgets.

Remember, for many of these counties, such as Piute County, UT, PILT is a substantial portion of their annual revenue stream. It is about one-fourth of the money that Piute County, UT, has to spend every single year.

Importantly, I offered an amendment to last year's budget that would build a deficit-neutral reserve fund to make sure PILT continued to be fully funded. That amendment passed. Unfortunately, the fact that it passed has apparently not been enough to make sure it continued to be funded.

Now we have a major funding bill before us. This spending bill occupies no fewer than 1,582 pages. It spends in excess of \$1.1 trillion. Yet PILT still isn't funded.

It is important to point out that even if we do the right thing and even if we fully fund PILT in this program this year, the PILT Program is itself still not adequate. It is still in need of reform. PILT payments are quite insufficient.

PILT was intended to soften the economic impact associated with the Federal Government owning so much of the land in the United States. In the case of Piute County, it is about three-fourths of the land. It is about two-thirds of the land throughout the State of Utah. In some counties in Utah, it is well in excess of 90, sometimes 95 percent of the land in a county. PILT was designed to soften that economic impact. But, regrettably, the Federal Government gives States, through the PILT Program, what amounts to in many instances only pennies on the dollar of what the taxing jurisdictions would receive if they were to tax that land, if they were to collect taxes—even if they were to collect those taxes at the lowest property tax rate, let's say the Greenbelt rate in many counties. We must correct that imbalance.

In the coming days I plan to introduce legislation to begin the process of doing precisely that. After all, it makes no sense to have a program that some would argue is deceptively entitled "Payment In Lieu of Taxes" if, in fact, the payment in lieu of taxes doesn't even closely approximate the value that counties would receive if they were actually allowed to tax that land and collect that revenue as taxes.

If an American citizen, a U.S. taxpayer, for example, decided to adopt his or her own PILT Program and on April 15 of each year just sent a check to the IRS saying: These are not my taxes, but this is my payment in lieu of taxes; I am just paying what I feel like paying, that would cause problems. The taxpayer in question would probably end up in prison. In any event, it wouldn't end well for the taxpayer. Yet we have allowed the Federal Government to get away with this over and over, often to the detriment of vulnerable communities, of poor communities, of communities that rely on the Federal Government's unsteady stream of revenue—a stream of revenue that, insufficient as it is already, is now being threatened altogether.

In a sense the problem we face with the Federal Government owning all this land is not new. It is a problem that has been around for a long time. In many respects it was a problem envisioned by some of the Founding Fathers. In fact, we can go all the way back to the Constitutional Convention of 1787 and see that it was on the minds of some of the Founding Fathers.

On September 5, 1787, at the Constitutional Convention they were discussing the public land-related authorities in the Constitution, including the authority that has now been included in what is often referred to as the enclave clause—article I, section 8, clause 17.

One of the delegates to the Federal Convention of 1787, Elbridge Gerry, the delegate from Massachusetts, stood before the Convention and made an astute observation. Mr. Gerry said as follows. He expressed concerns that "this power"—that is, the power of Congress over Federal public lands—"might be made use of to enslave any particular State by buying up its territory, and that the strongholds proposed would be a means of awing the State into an undue obedience to the General Government."

Then, as now, wise observations often came from the State of Massachusetts. Then, as now, we have a grave risk associated with the fact that when the Federal Government owns this much land, the Federal Government has this much power. It was on the minds of the delegates to the Convention of 1787 that one of the things they needed to protect against was the concentration of too much power in the hands of a few, especially the concentration of too much power within the Federal Government. Each of them had a mission to protect the sovereignty of their respective States. And they understood that if Congress had too much power to simply buy up too much land in any one State—disproportionately in some States—the Federal Government would have too much influence within that State.

I would ask you, when you look at this map I have in the Chamber, does that look equitable? Does that look like an equitable distribution of Federal land ownership? We have to keep in mind that, just as there are benefits associated with some of our public lands, there are also burdens attached to those benefits. When you look at those burdens, it is difficult to say anything other than that they are disproportionately allocated into a certain region of the United States. They are overwhelmingly located within the Rocky Mountains and areas west of the Rocky Mountains.

So to the extent these benefits benefit everyone in the United States, then the burdens ought to be shared by everyone in the United States as well. Yet they are not. PILT, again, is woefully inadequate as it is. But now Congress is trying to withdraw funding for PILT. Even though some may say: Well, we will fund it later this year, we have no guarantee of that, and we should be funding it right now.

As an interesting side note, in response to Elbridge Gerry's concern on September 5, 1787, the Founding Fathers put a qualifying clause into article I, section 8, clause 17. They said that Congress's plenary legislative jurisdiction over Federal public land lying within a sovereign State's boundaries would exist and could be exercised only if that land—the land in question—was acquired by the consent of the host State's legislature.

Some have suggested that this may well mean that when the Federal Government owns land, when it acquires

land within a sovereign State's territorial boundaries, that it owns that land just as any other proprietor would own it; that is, subject to the authority of the State and its political subdivisions to tax and regulate that land, unless or until such time as the host State's legislative body parts with that bundle of sovereign rights relative to that land. In other words, the State retains its taxing power over that land unless or until it voluntarily relinquishes it, gives it up, hands it over to the Federal Government. Yet, in nearly all instances where you see red on this map, that has not occurred.

Many of these States have been content with the fact that they have been receiving PILT funds, however inadequate those PILT funds may be. But now even those are going away. Even if there is a promise that they might be restored later—later this year—they are still inadequate, and we still do not have the promise that is going to occur now. There is still a lot of uncertainty in a lot of parts of the country—in places such as Piute County, UT, and elsewhere within my State and elsewhere within the western United States.

In order to protect against this kind of concern, the kind of concern that the delegate from Massachusetts described on September 5, 1787, Congress adopted a practice, when admitting new States into the Union, of incorporating language into the enabling act for each new State, describing what would happen to public land within the new State's boundaries after statehood. They adopted this practice and this language that would be used each time a new State was admitted into the Union.

That language was included in Utah's statehood enabling legislation—legislation that was adopted about 18 months before Utah finally came into the Union in January of 1896.

Section 9 of Utah's enabling legislation says that public land located within the State, lying within the State of Utah, "shall be sold by the United States subsequent to the admission of said State into the Union. . . ." Adding to that, section 9 of Utah's enabling legislation said that 5 percent of the proceeds from the sale of that land would be given to the State and would be held in a trust fund by that State for the benefit of the State's public education system.

So, as I mentioned, Utah was not the first State to have that kind of language in its enabling legislation. Many of the States that were admitted into the Union much earlier than Utah had similar language in their enabling acts. Missouri had such language. North Dakota had such language. We could name State after State after State that had such language.

When you look at Missouri, when you look at North Dakota, and when you look at most of the other States that had language such as that in their enabling acts, you see very little Federal

public land. You see because Congress and the Federal Government honored the promises made to those States. Congress followed through with that commitment. Congress did what it was supposed to do. It sold that land subsequent to statehood. Holding on perhaps to a few parcels here and there that it deemed necessary for one reason or another, it made good on that promise. Those States benefited. The Federal Treasury benefited. The American people benefited.

It is important to remember that what we are talking about here—when you see all this red on the map, representing Federal land ownership—is not about national parks. National parks represent a very tiny percentage of Federal land ownership. We are not talking about national monuments, which also represents a very tiny percentage of Federal land ownership. What we are talking about in the context of the PILT program are lands that are managed by the U.S. Bureau of Land Management, an agency that is considered obscure, almost unheard of throughout most of the United States, but an agency that operates with a particularly dominant force in States such as mine, where you see a lot of red on the map.

I remember the first time I showed this map to my children, my daughter Eliza, who was about 8 years old at the time, was just barely old enough to understand what I was explaining to her. I told her that the red indicated ownership of land by our national government. And 8-year-old Eliza looked at that portion of the map that represented our State, and she said: Look, dad, they own Utah. I said: You're right, Eliza, they own Utah. They certainly own the overwhelming majority of it.

Some of us have not forgotten this promise made in the statehood enabling acts of most of the States admitted into the Union, and yet Congress seems to be determined to overlook it. I am determined not to let that happen. Some of my friends back in Utah are likewise determined not to let that happen.

A good friend of mine, Representative Ken Ivory, who serves in the Utah State legislature, has done an amazing job educating people throughout Utah and, in fact, across America on this very subject, on what happened with these statehood enabling acts, and why it is that States in the western United States got left behind when it came to promises made long ago by the Federal Government. I commend Representative Ivory for his work on this issue and pledge to continue working with him on this important project.

You see, this is about much more than land. This is about the ability of local communities not only to thrive, but to survive. This is about communities where it is very difficult for people to get jobs. It is very difficult for people, in some instances, even to access their own property, even to access

their own farms because it is impossible to get anywhere without crossing Federal public land and in some instances Federal land managers will block access to the only roads they can use to access their own property. This has to stop.

In the meantime, it is vitally important that we focus on the issues at hand, that we focus, at a bare minimum, on promises that the Federal Government has extended in lieu of the other promises. That is not to say we are going to forget about the promises made in the statehood enabling acts. We are not. But, for the moment, my attention remains focused on making sure we fund the PILT Program. It has to be funded. In fact, it has to be funded even more than it has been in the past. It ought to reflect at least a rough equivalent of the amount of money the taxing jurisdiction could collect if it were taxing that land at its lowest rate. And, at a bare minimum, even below that, we have to make sure the program continues to exist. We have to make sure the program is funded at least at its current levels. This is not asking much. But it is necessary that we do this.

The broken PILT Program is, one could argue, just another example of government applying significant and unnecessary weight to the shoulders of hard-working Americans, many of whom are struggling just to get by, many of whom are barely able to keep food on the table for their families, others of whom are able to provide for the day-to-day needs of their families but they are worried about what happens next. They find that whenever they find a little bit of additional income, no sooner have they earned it than they find it has been swallowed up—swallowed up by increasing taxes, swallowed up by higher prices for goods and for services, and they do not know how to get out of this rut in which they find themselves somewhat trapped. These are the kinds of people who suffer the most as a result of the Federal Government's failed policies relative to its Federal public land.

We have to remember that lifting these weights is not only within the government's power, it is the affirmative obligation of government to lift those weights. In an 1861 address to Congress, President Abraham Lincoln said the "leading object" of American government was "to elevate the condition of men—to lift artificial weights from all shoulders, to clear the paths of laudable pursuit for all, to afford all an unfettered start and a fair chance, in the race of life."

Current PILT policy imposes government waste that makes it more difficult for communities to provide important services such as schools, police, and fire departments. It hampers the ability of States to budget, plan, and provide for infrastructure improvements, make needed reforms to their tax systems, and attract new businesses and new jobs.

This policy—and the Federal land management policies that accompany the PILT policy more generously—is broken, and it is imposing a heavy burden on our communities, particularly in rural areas where the Federal Government owns much, most or in some cases nearly all of the land and where needs are at their very greatest.

The program is already broken. The program is already causing millions and millions of Americans to suffer. The program is already severely impeding economic opportunity for Americans, deepening the existing crisis of opportunity that we have in this country, which manifests itself on three different levels: immobility among the poor, insecurity among the middle class, and cronyist privilege at the top.

If you live in one of these States, it might be great if you are one of those people who owns one of the few parcels of land that is not owned by the Federal Government. It is not so great if you live in one of the areas where the Federal Government owns basically everything, where you can do very little anywhere around you without permission from the Federal Government, where your local government is barely able to survive because it lacks a property tax base, and the Federal Government fails to adequately fund PILT and threatens—in this circumstance—to withdraw funding from PILT altogether.

I respectfully implore all of my colleagues to consider the inequities inherent in this map, the inequities inherent in the PILT Program, and, for present purposes, to remember we need to fund PILT.

It has to be reformed, absolutely, and we have to examine our Federal land ownership and management policies more broadly. Today we need to focus on making sure PILT is funded.

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.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

IRAN

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I come to the floor this evening to discuss an issue of national security, and that is how to prevent a nuclear armed Iran.

I was thinking about our troubled history with Iran and whether more sanctions at this time makes sense for our national security interests, and I asked myself these questions:

Can, in fact, a country like Iran change?

Is it possible for an isolated regime to rejoin the community of nations and change its behavior after several decades?

Must a country and its people be held captive because of the behavior of previous leaders in earlier times?

So I thought back in history. I was a young girl during World War II. I remember when Imperial Japan killed millions in Southeast Asia, and particularly in China, during its brutal wars of expansion. Today, Japan is a peaceful democracy and one of this Nation's strongest allies in Asia.

I remember when Hitler and the German Third Reich committed unspeakable atrocities across Europe, including the murder of 6 million Jewish citizens. Germany is now a close ally, a leader in the European Union, an institution created to ensure a war never again occurs in Europe.

I remember General Franco's Spain, which was so diplomatically and economically isolated that it was actually barred from the United Nations until 1955. Spain is now a close partner of the United States and a fully democratic member of the European Union.

The former Yugoslavia, Vietnam, and South Africa have all experienced tremendous change in recent decades. Independent states have emerged from the painful dissolution of Yugoslavia. Vietnam has opened itself to the international community but still has much progress to make. South Africa has shed apartheid and has emerged as an increasingly stable nation on a much divided continent.

So I believe countries can change. This capacity to change also applies to the pursuit of nuclear weapons. At one time, Sweden, South Korea, and Argentina each pursued nuclear weapons.

Following World War II, Sweden pursued nuclear weapons to deter foreign attack. It mastered nuclear technology and built and tested components for a nuclear weapon. It may have even obtained enough nuclear material to build a bomb. But in 1970, it signed the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, and it ended its nuclear weapon program.

In the early 1970s, South Korea actively sought a nuclear device. The United States heavily pressured South Korea not to go nuclear, and in April 1975, South Korea signed the nonproliferation treaty and halted its nuclear weapons activity.

Throughout the 1980s, when it was ruled by a military junta with an egregious human rights record, Argentina had a covert nuclear weapons program. It built uranium production, enrichment, and reprocessing facilities, and it attempted to develop nuclear-capable ballistic missiles before abandoning its nuclear weapons program and ratifying the NPT in 1995.

So the question comes, is Iran willing to change its past behavior and abandon its pursuit of a nuclear weapon? It may well be, and it is the job of diplomacy to push for that change.

I believe there are positive signs that Iran is interested in such a change, and I would like to explain my reasons.

The election of Hassan Rouhani was a surprise to many long-time observers of Iran because he campaigned in support of repairing Iran's relationship with the West.

Since his inauguration he has tried to do exactly that. For the first time since the Iranian revolution, the leaders of our countries have been in direct communication with each other. Where once direct contact even between senior officials was rare, now Secretary of State John Kerry and Under Secretary of State Wendy Sherman are in near constant contact with their Iranian counterparts. Those conversations produced the historic Geneva agreement which goes into effect in 6 days, on January 20.

Candidate Rouhani also promised to increase nuclear transparency, and he has delivered on that as well. Even before the Geneva interim agreement was reached, Iran slowed uranium enrichment and construction for the Arak heavy water reactor—maybe for technical reasons, maybe not, but it slowed. Iran has also reengaged with the IAEA to resolve questions surrounding its nuclear activities.

So what has been achieved in Geneva? The interim 6-month agreement reached between the P5+1 countries, the United States, China, Russia, the UK, France, Germany, freezes Iran's nuclear program in place while a comprehensive agreement is negotiated in the next 6 months. This agreement caps Iran's stockpile of enriched uranium at 5 percent. It stops the production of 20 percent enriched uranium. It requires the neutralization of Iran's stockpile of 20 percent uranium. It prevents Iran from installing additional centrifuges or operating its most advanced centrifuges. It prohibits it from stockpiling excess centrifuges. It halts all significant work at the Arak heavy water reactor and prevents Iran from constructing a plutonium reprocessing facility.

Most importantly, the interim agreement imposes the most intrusive international inspection regime ever. International inspectors will independently verify whether Iran is complying with the interim agreement. For the first time, the International Atomic Energy Agency inspectors will have uninterrupted access to Iran's enrichment facilities at Natanz and Fordow, centrifuge production plants, centrifuge assembly facilities, and Iran's uranium mines and mills. Finally, Iran is required to declare all planned new nuclear facilities.

In exchange, the P5+1 negotiators offered sanctions relief limited to \$7 billion, an aspect of the interim agreement that has been criticized and I wish to talk about it for a moment.

Here are the facts on that sanctions relief which, in my view, does not materially alter the biting sanctions which have devastated Iran's economy. The vast majority of sanctions relief comes in the form of Iranian repatriation of \$4.2 billion of its own money. Iran will continue to lose \$4 billion to \$5 billion a month in lost oil revenue from existing sanctions. Iran will not have access to about \$100 billion of its own reserves trapped by sanctions abroad.

For perspective, the total estimated sanctions relief is valued at approximately only 1 percent of the Iranian economy, hardly a significant amount.

I wish to take a moment to detail what is not in the interim agreement.

First, it does not grant Iran a right to enrich. The United States does not recognize such a right for the five non-nuclear weapons states that currently have enrichment programs, and we will make no exception for Iran. But Iran does have a right to peaceful nuclear energy if it fully abides by the terms of its safeguards agreement under the NPT.

Secondly, the agreement does not in any way unravel our core oil and financial sanctions. Others have argued the suspension of any sanctions against Iran will unravel the entire sanctions regime, and that is false. The Obama administration has taken action to ensure that does not happen.

Two days after the interim agreement was reached, the United States settled with a Swiss Oil Services Company over sanctions violations. The settlement was more than \$250 million. It was the largest against a foreign firm outside of the banking industry.

On December 12, the administration announced the expansion of Iranian entities subject to sanctions. These entities either helped Tehran evade sanctions or provided support to Iran's nuclear program.

On January 7 of this year, the administration halted the transfer of two Boeing airplane engines from Turkey to Iran. Through these actions, the Obama administration has made it abundantly clear that the United States will continue to enforce our existing sanctions against Iran.

Third, the agreement does not codify the violation of U.N. security resolutions. Critics have attacked the interim agreement for its failure to completely halt all of Iran's nuclear enrichment by noting that six U.N. Security Council Resolutions have called on Tehran to do so and it has not done so.

The purpose of the U.N. Resolutions was not to suspend nuclear enrichment indefinitely. Instead, these resolutions were designed to freeze Iran's nuclear activities until the IAEA could determine whether Iran's activities were for exclusively peaceful purposes.

This is an important point. The interim agreement achieves what the six U.N. Security Council Resolutions could not. It freezes Iran's nuclear progress while a comprehensive, verifiable agreement is being negotiated over the next 6 months.

The interim agreement was only possible because a strong international sanctions regime has worked to convince rank-and-file Iranians, candidly, that enough is enough.

According to the State Department, as a result of the sanctions, Iran's crude oil exports have plummeted from approximately 2.5 million barrels per day in 2011 to around 1 million barrels per day in recent months. This decline

alone costs Iran \$3 billion to \$5 billion per month in lost revenue.

In total, 23 nations who import Iranian oil have eliminated or significantly reduced purchases from Iran. In fact, Iran currently has only six customers for its oil: China, India, Turkey, South Korea, Japan, and Taiwan.

In the last year, Iran's gross domestic product shrunk by 5.8 percent. Its GDP shrunk in 1 year by 5.8 percent, while inflation is estimated to be 50 percent or more.

Prices for food and consumer goods are doubling and tripling on an annual basis, and estimates put unemployment as high as 35 percent while underemployment is pervasive.

This is why Iran says enough is enough. The sanctions are biting and they are biting deeply, and there is no need to put additional sanctions on the table at this time.

This body may soon consider the Nuclear Weapon Free Iran Act; that is, a bill to do exactly the opposite, to impose additional sanctions against Iran, do it now, and hold it in abeyance.

Before casting a vote, Senators should ask themselves what would happen if the bill passes and a promised veto by the President is not sustained. I would like to give my view.

I sincerely believe the P5+1 negotiations with Iran would end and, with it, the best opportunity in more than 30 years to make a major change in Iranian behavior—a change that could not only open all kinds of economic opportunities for the Iranian people, but help change the course of a nation. Its destiny in fact could be changed.

Passing additional sanctions now would only play into the hands of those in Iran who are most eager to see diplomacy fail. Iranian conservatives, hardliners, will attack President Rouhani and Foreign Minister Zarif for seeking a nuclear compromise.

They will argue that Iran exchanged a freeze of its nuclear program for additional and harsh punitive sanctions. Think about that. They will say that Iran did not achieve anything with this agreement. All we got were more sanctions.

Second, if the United States cannot honor an interim agreement negotiated in Geneva by Russia, China, France, Germany, the UK and ourselves—we are not alone in this—it will never lift sanctions after a final agreement is reached.

Above all, they will argue that the United States is not interested in nuclear diplomacy—we are interested in regime change.

The bottom line: If this body passes S. 1881, diplomatic negotiations will collapse, and there will be no final agreement.

Some might want that result, but I do not.

Iran's nuclear program would once again be unrestrained, and the only remaining option to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon would be military action. I do not want that unless it is absolutely necessary.

To date, the prospect of just considering this bill has prompted Iranian legislators to consider retaliation. There is talk that the legislative branch, called the Majles, may move to increase nuclear enrichment far beyond the 5-percent limit in the interim agreement and much closer to, if not achieving, weapons-grade uranium.

So the authors of additional sanctions in this body and Iranian hardliners in the other body would actually combine to blow up the diplomatic effort of 6 major powers.

The bill's sponsors have argued that sanctions would strengthen the United States's hand in negotiations. They argue that sanctions brought Iran to the negotiating table in the first place. They contend that additional sanctions would force Iran to abandon its nuclear program.

I could not disagree more.

Let me give the views of a few other people who are knowledgeable in the arena: Dr. Paul Pillar, a former U.S. intelligence official and current professor at Georgetown University recently argued:

It is the prospect of having U.S.-led sanctions removed that will convince Iran to accept severe restrictions on its nuclear program. Threatening Iran with additional sanctions now—after it has agreed to the interim agreement and an interim agreement is about to go into effect—will not convince Tehran to complete a final agreement.

I couldn't agree more.

If this bill would help our negotiators, as its authors contend, they would say so.

I believe this bill is an egregious imposition on the Executive's authority to conduct foreign affairs. In fact, our Secretary of State has formally asked this Congress to give our negotiators and our experts the time and space to do their jobs, including no new sanctions.

What does this body say, sitting here? We are not going to do that? This is a Secretary of State who is of this body, Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, who has been absolutely prodigious in his efforts to get this interim agreement, has gotten it, and we are going to run the risk that it is going to break apart during the next 6 months when a final agreement might well be negotiated?

If the Senate imposes its will, if we override the President's veto, and it blows up this very fragile process, some would say: Too bad, what a tragedy.

We know what the Iranian reaction will be. The Iranian Foreign Minister Zarif, who I happen to have known for a substantial period of time, has clearly stated what the result will be in five words, and it is this: "The entire deal is dead."

That is his direct quote. Why wouldn't we take him at his word? So far he has been good to his word.

The ambassador of our staunchest ally, the UK, warned this body not to pass more sanctions. Sir Peter Westmacott recently wrote:

Further sanctions now would only hurt negotiations and risk eroding international support for the sanctions that have brought us this far. The time for additional measures will come if Iran reneges on the deal or negotiations fail. Now is not that time.

I deeply believe that a vote for this legislation will cause negotiations to collapse. The United States, not Iran, then becomes the party that risks fracturing the international coalition that has enabled our sanctions to succeed in the first place.

It says to the UK, China, Russia, France, and Germany that our country cannot be trusted to stand behind our diplomatic commitments. That is a very big statement.

Our allies will question whether their compliance with sanctions and the economic sacrifices they have made are for naught.

Should these negotiations fall apart, the choices are few and the most likely result, in my view, is the eventual and inevitable use of military force.

So I ask this body, Is that the choice we want to make? In 6 days the tentative agreement will go into place. We want to pass this? We don't even want to wait and see what happens?

We don't even want to wait and see what the IAEA finds when they are in there 24-7, 365 days a year?

I think what we ought to do is concentrate on Iranian compliance with the interim agreement.

On January 20, 2014, this agreement comes into effect, 6 days from now, and over the next 6 months the international community will be able to verify whether or not Iran is keeping its commitments to freeze its nuclear progress.

If Iran fails to abide by the terms of the interim agreement, or if a final agreement cannot be negotiated, Congress can immediately consider additional sanctions.

I deeply believe that additional sanctions should only be considered once our diplomatic track has been given the opportunity to forge a final, comprehensive, and binding agreement.

This is what is most distressing. If we had not reached an agreement, with the cooperation and leadership of the big powers of this world, that would be one thing. The fact is we have reached agreement and that action is just about to take place, and we are going to jaundice it, we are going to hurt it, and we are likely to collapse it by passing additional sanctions now which a President of the United States will veto with the aim of overriding that veto.

How does that make any kind of common sense? It defies logic, it threatens instant reverse, and it ends what has been unprecedented diplomacy. Do we want to take that on our shoulders? Candidly, in my view, it is a march toward war.

As Chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee, I know the challenges Iran poses to U.S. interests around the world.

I see the majority leader is on the floor.

Would the majority leader like me to cease for a moment?

Mr. REID. Go ahead and finish.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. As I said, as Chairman of the Intelligence Committee, I know the challenges Iran poses to the U.S. interests around the world. Its patronage of the terrorist group Hezbollah, its support for Syria's Bashar Assad through the Revolutionary Guard Corps are two of the most troubling.

I would hope that as a followthrough of diplomacy we might be able to quell some of these activities.

Let me acknowledge Israel's real, well-founded concerns that a nuclear-armed Iran would threaten its very existence. I don't disagree with that. I agree with it, but they are not there yet.

While I recognize and share Israel's concern, we cannot let Israel determine when and where the United States goes to war. By stating that the United States should provide military support to Israel in a formal resolution should it attack Iran, I fear that is how this bill is going to be interpreted.

Let me conclude. The interim agreement with Iran is strong, it is tough, and it is realistic. It represents the first significant opportunity to change a three-decade course in Iran and an opening to improve one of our most poisonous bilateral relationships. It could open the door to a new future which not only considers Israel's national security, but protects our own.

To preserve diplomacy, I strongly oppose the Nuclear Weapon Free Iran Act.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DONNELLY). The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I express my appreciation to the courtesy of the Senator from California. She is courteous in everything she does in life. She is a pleasure to serve with.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.J. RES. 106

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 12 noon on Wednesday, January 15, the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.J. Res. 106, which was received from the House and is at the desk; that there be no amendments, motions, or points of order in order to the joint resolution; that there be 15 minutes of debate equally divided on the joint resolution; finally, that upon the use or yielding back of time, the joint resolution be read a third time and the Senate proceed to vote on passage of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

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 allowed to speak therein up to 10 minutes each.

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

RECOGNIZING GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I rise today, as an alumna of Georgetown University, to recognize the university's 225th anniversary. On January 23, 1789, the first deed was granted to then Bishop John Carroll for land on which Georgetown was built. Those of us whose lives have been shaped, at least in part, by this great institution are proud that it was founded in the same year that the United States was formed. Indeed, the two events were intertwined, and Georgetown's mission statement today continues to reflect that bond by emphasizing that the university "educates women and men to be reflective lifelong learners, to be responsible and active participants in civil life and to live generously in service to others."

Over the course of more than two centuries, Georgetown, its students, and alumni have contributed to our country's rich history. The Astronomical Observatory on campus was used to calculate the longitude and latitude of the District of Columbia in 1846. This building stands today and is now listed on the National Register of Historic Places. Buildings on the Georgetown campus were used as hospitals for wounded troops during the Civil War, which nearly closed the university because so many students left to fight, for both the Union and Confederate States. All told, more than 1,000 Georgetown students and alumni served. In 1876, the students selected the colors blue—Union—and gray—Confederate—as the university's official colors to celebrate the end of the war. These colors remain a source of school pride today.

Father Patrick Healy, born a slave, became the first African American to head a major U.S. university, serving as Georgetown's president from 1873 to 1882. With the outbreak of World War I, Georgetown formed a 500-member Cadet Corps in the spring of 1917. In 1918, the U.S. War Department replaced it with the Student Army Training Corps, which became the Reserve Officers Training Corps as we know it today following the end of the war. More than 2,000 Georgetown men served. During World War II, Georgetown was selected by the War Department to house the Army Specialized Training Program. Over 75-percent of students enrolled during the 1943-1944 academic year were military service-men.

Since Georgetown awarded its first two bachelor's degrees in 1817, the university has educated numerous leaders in business, government, and the non-profit sector. A President, Cabinet Secretaries, Ambassadors, Governors, and Members of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives have studied on "the Hilltop" and left to make impor-

tant contributions to our country and beyond. Likewise, Georgetown alumni have gone on to lead school systems, universities, and businesses, as well as international and charitable organizations that strive to address challenges facing the United States and the world.

A school with an enrollment of 40 students in its first year has now swelled to over 12,000 undergraduate and graduate students, more than 5,000 faculty and staff, and countless alumni. In addition to undergraduate degrees, Georgetown University now includes the McDonough School of Business, Walsh School of Foreign Service, Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, Law Center, School of Medicine, School of Nursing and Health Studies, and McCourt School of Public Policy.

I was privileged to have the opportunity to earn a Georgetown degree, and my experience there has played a significant role in the career of public service I have been blessed to live. It is a place that gave me opportunities to be exposed to public service here in the Nation's Capital as a student and impressed on me a set of values reflecting Jesuit tradition that continue to shape my life and work.

Georgetown's history has in many ways tracked the Nation's history. It is a pleasure to recognize the tremendous impact it has had over the last 225 years and to look forward to future centuries of contributions not only to this country but to the world.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the 225th anniversary of the founding of Georgetown University. As a proud member of the Georgetown community, it is an honor to help commemorate the school's 225 years of excellence. This milestone marks a time of celebration for all of Georgetown's students, faculty, board of governors, and alumni.

As the oldest Catholic and Jesuit institution of higher education in the United States, Georgetown has a long and distinguished history. On January 23, 1789, Bishop John Carroll, the first Catholic bishop in the United States, secured the deed to around 60 acres of land overlooking the Potomac River. This hilltop grew to become the campus of Georgetown University. Three years later, in 1791, the first students arrived on campus. At the age of 13, William Gaston was the first student at the university. He went on to serve North Carolina as a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives and authored a bill granting a Federal charter to "the College of Georgetown in the District of Columbia" in 1815. President James Madison signed that legislation into law on March 1, 1815.

While buildings on Georgetown's campus were temporarily used as a hospital after the Second Battle of Bull Run, it wasn't until 1851 that Georgetown University Medical School, which I attended in the 1970s, was established. It was the first Catholic medical school in our Nation. The medical school first