



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 112th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 157

WASHINGTON, SUNDAY, JULY 31, 2011

No. 118

Senate

The Senate met at 12 noon and was called to order by the Honorable RICHARD BLUMENTHAL, a Senator from the State of Connecticut.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Save us, O God, for the waters are coming in upon us. We are weary from the struggle, tempted to throw in the towel. But quitting is not an option. Today, fill our lawmakers with the spirit of Your wisdom, guiding their footsteps to a desired destination. Draw near to them and deliver them from evil, for the kingdom, the power, and the glory belong to You. You are our strength and shield and our hearts can faithfully trust in You. Save Your people and bless their inheritance.

We pray in Your strong Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable RICHARD BLUMENTHAL led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. INOUE).

The bill clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, July 31, 2011.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable RICHARD BLUMENTHAL, a Senator from the State of Connecticut, to perform the duties of the Chair.

DANIEL K. INOUE,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following any leader remarks, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to concur in the House message to accompany S. 627, which is the legislative vehicle for the debt limit increase, with the time until 1 p.m. equally divided. At about 1 p.m., the Senate will vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the House message with the Reid amendment.

No matter the outcome of this vote, the message will still be before this body. If there is an agreement that can be met, this is the vehicle that will be used to send it back to the House.

THE DEBT CEILING

Mr. REID. Mr. President, as the clock ticks down to August 2, I want to remind everyone within the sound of my voice what is at stake. At this very moment, millions of seniors across this great country worry that their next Social Security check might not come to them on Wednesday. Middle-class families wonder whether their retirement accounts will be wiped out by an economic collapse brought about by default on this Nation's debt. Active military personnel, including many who are risking their lives for our great Nation, worry whether they will receive their paychecks.

The Associated Press reported that ADM Mike Mullen, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, visited with troops serving in Afghanistan yester-

day. The soldiers Admiral Mullen talked with were not asking about military strategy or how our troop drawdown in Afghanistan would affect them. No, they asked whether they would be paid if Republicans forced the U.S. Government to stop paying its bills. In a region that has been rocked by violence and plagued by suicide bombers this month, they wondered how they would take care of their families if their checks stopped coming next month.

Let me read a little bit of that United Press story that came out yesterday:

A half a world away from Capitol Hill deadlock, the economy and debt crisis are weighing heavily on U.S. troops in Afghanistan. And the top question on their minds Saturday even as bombing rocked the city around them, was one the top U.S. military officer couldn't answer. Will we get paid?

Admiral Mullen went on to say: I don't know the answer to that question.

But either way to those soldiers he said: All of you must continue to work every day.

This is unacceptable. A country as rich and powerful as ours, men and women with bombs going off around them should not worry whether this country will leave them high and dry. This afternoon I ask those who have said they will never compromise on any terms to think about who their stubbornness will hurt: seniors, soldiers, and others.

I have spoken to the Vice President this morning—in fact, a couple of times. He is hopeful—of course, we have to be hopeful—that we are close to an agreement with Republican leaders. The framework of this agreement is based on new ideas and some old ideas. After speaking to Republican Leader MITCH MCCONNELL this morning, we are cautiously optimistic.

There are a number of issues yet to be resolved, and we must understand that. There is no agreement that has been made. We are optimistic that one

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S5147

can be reached, but we are not there yet. Optimism in the days past has been stomped on at various times. These major issues still to be resolved in these ongoing discussions is something we have to resolve in the next few hours if they are going to be resolved. Each of them must be resolved before we have a final agreement. And as we know, one problem can stop the whole agreement from going forward. But we want to get something done as quickly as possible. I believe all sides are aware of this urgency. It is unfortunate that the House of Representatives wasted all last week on legislation they knew would never pass the Senate and, in fact, barely passed the House. It passed the House with only Republican votes, not a single Democratic vote.

Democrats have said all along that we would never agree to a short-term arrangement that would put our economy at risk and force Congress into another debt ceiling showdown in a few weeks. We have to move on. The House measure put off the debt ceiling for 5 months—August, September, October, November, and December—5 months. We would be back in this same debate in a matter of weeks. We cannot allow that to happen. So any agreement has to have a long-term approach. The long-term approach we have forged here in the Senate is absolutely necessary. We must give the financial markets the confidence this country will not shirk its obligations now or in the future.

I know the compromise being discussed at the White House adopts the Senate's long-term approach, which will give the economy the certainty it needs, take us past January 2013. That has to be done. That will be done if an agreement is reached. It is also crucial that the agreement being crafted set us on the path to fiscal restraint. There are still elements to be resolved. We are watching them very closely.

The settlement must include thoughtful constraints on spending, we know that. The 12-member commission I conceived to recommend additional deficit reduction measures this year will be a key to that effort. I say to my friend the Republican leader, I appreciate his wrapping his arms around this and being such a cheerleader for this idea. It is a good idea. It is an idea that Congress itself will solve the problem. It would be a joint committee that would move forward. There would be a trigger that if they did not resolve this, then something else would happen. Based on past experiences, I think there would be tremendous incentive not to let that certain thing happen when the trigger kicked in. So Senator MCCONNELL and I agreed the commission owns the responsibility to set this country on the path to fiscal accountability. The joint committee—there are no constraints—can look at any program we have in government—any program. It has the ability to look at everything. That is what needs to be

done. The commission will assure we undertake that responsibility.

When I thought of this idea about the commission, I knew it was important that it achieve real results. It will be essential to choose Members with open minds willing to consider every option, even when the options are tough pills to swallow for both parties. So cooperation is the only way forward. Compromise is the only way forward. This is what Andrew Carnegie said about the virtue of compromise:

I shall argue that strong men . . . —

And since the Senate has changed so dramatically—and strong women—that is me. I stuck that in.

I shall argue that strong men . . . know when to compromise and that all principles can be compromised to serve a greater principle.

Andrew Carnegie. But perhaps President Abraham Lincoln said it best when he said this: "Determine that the thing can and shall be done, and that we shall find the way."

That is where we are today. We must determine that the thing can and shall be done, and then we need to find that way. That is President Abraham Lincoln.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

ESTABLISHING THE COMMISSION ON FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT PROCESSING DELAYS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the House message to accompany S. 627, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

Motion to concur in the House amendment to S. 627, an act to establish the Commission on Freedom of Information Act Processing Delays, with an amendment.

Pending:

Reid motion to concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill, with Reid amendment No. 589, to cut spending, maintain existing commitments, and for other purposes.

Reid amendment No. 590 (to amendment No. 589), to change the enactment date.

Reid motion to refer the message of the House on the bill to the Committee on the Budget, with instructions, Reid amendment No. 591, to change the enactment date.

Reid amendment No. 592 (to the instructions (amendment No. 591) on the motion to refer), of a perfecting nature.

Reid amendment No. 593 (to amendment No. 592), of a perfecting nature.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the time until 1 p.m. shall be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees.

The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, let me first compliment the majority leader. I think he said it accurately; that is, we need to find a compromise between

where we are, so we can move forward with increasing the debt limit, and a credible plan to reduce the deficit. I have heard many of my colleagues talk about that. But I want to point out that Leader REID's proposal that we will be voting cloture on in a few moments is a compromise.

It includes two major provisions that the Republicans have been asking about that, quite frankly, many Democrats disagree with. First, there will be a dollar for dollar reduction in spending for the increase in the debt ceiling.

Let me tell you, there is no relationship between the debt ceiling and spending. The debt ceiling represents funds that have already been committed that we have an obligation to pay. We all understand what would happen if we violated the debt ceiling. It would affect the credit of America, its standing internationally, the dollar's global significance, it would affect our creditworthiness in America, increase the cost of government borrowing, increase the spending for all taxpayers in this country.

It would have effects in my own State of Maryland. We have been told that the Maryland bond rating is very much tied to the Federal bond rating, and it could very well cause a downgrade for Maryland taxpayers, increase costs for mortgages, for credit cards. Every family would be affected.

So the Reid bill yields to what the Republicans have asked. And although there is no relationship to the debt ceiling and the spending, because these are bills that have already been incurred, there is dollar for dollar reduction in spending for every dollar increase in the debt.

The second major concession the Democrats have already made in the Reid proposal is that there is no revenue in this. We have been talking for a long time. If we are going to have a credible plan to reduce the deficit, we have to include all of the elements of Federal spending. We have a lot of what are called tax expenditures: monies that are spent in our Tax Code.

Some of these dollars are spent on shelters and loopholes that we should close. I have taken the floor several times to talk about several of these loopholes, the ethanol credit that we should not give for ethanol subsidies, the funds that go to gas and oil companies.

There are a lot of loopholes in our Tax Code that we could close. The Reid proposal has made an accommodation to the Republicans to say: Okay, you said that is a deal killer. That is not in the Reid proposal.

So the Reid proposal is the largest amount of deficit reduction—\$2.4 trillion of deficit reduction or \$2.4 trillion of debt ceiling increase so we can get through March of next year, March of 2013, the year after. That gives us the stability we need. And we know what we have gone through already as far as the debt ceiling debate. It has already hurt our country. We don't want to go

through this again. That is what I think is critically important by moving forward to get this done.

We are going to have a vote in about 45 minutes. That vote is on cloture. I want to explain that. Senator LEVIN talked about it yesterday. What the Republicans are doing is they are filibustering the debt limit bill. It is a filibuster. They are requiring us now to have 60 votes rather than a simple majority. The Speaker of the House passed his proposal in the House with a majority of those voting. That is what democracy should be about. We are talking about the debt limit increase and whether it is a type of issue that should be filibustered by the Republicans. They are doing that—filibustering it—and their vote in a little while will determine whether we should be able to move forward without a 60-vote threshold.

The majority leader pointed out that on previous occasions we have taken up the debt ceiling and we have not required a 60-vote threshold. I had my staff pull the information about the debt ceiling votes we had when George W. Bush was President. The Senate passed the debt ceiling increase by a 68-29 vote on June 11, 2002—with no requirement for a 60-vote threshold. We had another vote on May 23, 2003, that passed the Senate by a 53-to-44 vote, and there was no filibuster of that by the Democrats. We had a vote on November 17, 2004, with a debt ceiling increase of \$800 billion. The vote was 52 to 44 in the Senate. Again, there was no effort made to require a 60-vote threshold, and there was no effort made to filibuster that issue. Then again on September 27, 2007, the debt ceiling was increased by \$850 billion by a vote of 53 to 42. On a fourth occasion—March 16, 2006—there was a 52-48 vote for a debt ceiling increase. Once again, there was no effort made to filibuster that issue.

Webster's Dictionary defines "filibuster" as "the use of extreme dilatory tactics to delay or prevent action by the majority in a legislative or deliberative assembly." That is exactly what the Republicans are doing if they vote against the cloture motion in a few moments. They are using extreme dilatory tactics to deny the majority the opportunity to take up an issue.

I know we are close to working out an agreement. I certainly hope we work out an agreement. I have been saying on the floor of the Senate for a long time that Democrats and Republicans need to put the Nation's interests first.

We have two goals: to increase the debt ceiling and have a credible plan to deal with the deficit. The Reid proposal offers solutions to both of those goals. I hope we have a bipartisan agreement before the day is out. We can move forward.

I think it is critically important that the Members of the Senate express whether they believe we should be filibustering a debt limit increase. I believe that is not the right precedent for

this body to set. We should always allow the debt ceiling to be increased by a majority vote. That is what they did in the House; that is what we should be doing in the Senate.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the cloture motion, but let's continue this discussion because in order to get a bill to the President's desk, we know we are going to have to reach further compromises. We understand that. We have had, I think, some discussions among our colleagues here, and I am hopeful we will be able to reach that type of a compromise.

We have a chance, in a few minutes, to move forward so that we can express ourselves that we should be doing this in the Senate by majority vote. I urge my colleagues to support cloture and support the Reid proposal.

I ask unanimous consent that during the quorum call, the time be equally divided between the Democrats and the Republicans.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARDIN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I wish to join others of my colleagues in thanking and commending the majority leader, Senator REID, for his tireless and relentless work in extraordinarily difficult circumstances. He has been a model for me as a new Member of the Senate in leading this body, along with many of my other Democratic colleagues in the leadership and some of our Republican colleagues as well.

Senator JOHNNY ISAKSON, of Georgia, who spoke to this Chamber yesterday morning, demonstrated his determination, as others on the other side of the aisle have done, to work together in reaching an agreement. As the majority leader said moments ago, the words of the day must be "cooperation" and "compromise." Those are the words we are hearing from countless Americans, including my fellow citizens of Connecticut, day after day: We want you to get the job done, put aside the partisan differences. America is speaking with one voice, and Washington must listen.

I am new to Washington. I haven't been here for long. I have just marked my first 6 months in the Senate. But I understand more and more why my fellow Connecticut citizens and other Americans are so frustrated and often appalled by what goes on here. This situation is outrageous. We have an impending crisis—self-created—and devastating possible wounds—self-in-

flicted—and Washington has been deadlocked.

There is a glimmer of hope, a reason to be cautiously optimistic. The solution is in sight, but still work needs to be done. Washington needs to end the gridlock, the straitjacket that has been self-imposed, and take action to protect citizens from financial catastrophe. Our Nation is really at a crossroads. We need to rein in spending, cut the debt and deficits, make the tough choices necessary to get our fiscal house in order, and we need to do it now.

The fiscal news in the last few days—the anemic and fragile measures of recovery—shows more than ever why we need certainty now, certainty that ending this deadlock will produce. Uncertainty is the enemy—enemy for businesses that are deciding whether to hire, for banks wanting to loan money to those businesses, and for larger corporations sitting on mountains of cash waiting to invest and create jobs.

Jobs and our economy are the main reasons to make these tough choices literally today, to make these tough choices now. We have a historic moment, and we must seize it. We cannot keep kicking these decisions down the road. Families in Connecticut and across the country make these tough choices every day. They rightfully expect nothing less from us. Tough choices are necessary to help get our debt and our deficit under control.

I have heard as late as this morning, Sunday morning, from hundreds of Connecticut residents who are frustrated and appalled at what is going on here, what they see in Washington, DC.

Bernice, from Tolland, CT, cannot believe we don't have an agreement. She is worried she won't receive her Social Security check next month.

Jane, from West Hartford, is wondering why we are protecting sweetheart deals instead of ensuring Social Security is protected and strengthened.

Rod, from New Milford, just wants us to compromise and to get something done and end this nightmare.

I agree with them and hundreds of others from Connecticut and around the country who want to make sure that the troops in Afghanistan are paid, that their families are taken care of. I thank the citizens from Connecticut for calling or writing to me.

I agree that the immediate solution is not only to raise the debt ceiling but also to cut spending, as the Reid proposal makes clear, dollar for dollar to match that increase in that debt ceiling, without tax increases—none—without any cuts in Medicare or Medicaid—none. Those basic principles in the Reid proposal are what should be embodied in what the outcome is of this debate.

The markets need a real solution, not a short-term fix, to demonstrate that we are dedicated to achieving real results in cutting spending.

Anne, from Hamden, CT, makes this point. She just called yesterday to say

that a short-term plan would not provide the certainty the markets are desperately seeking. I agree that no short-term plan can provide that kind of certainty. It risks a credit rating downgrade and ensures we will be back here in another 6 months.

As much as we may criticize the rating agencies—and I have been one to criticize them most vehemently as an attorney general of Connecticut and now as a Member of this body—we must deal with that reality at this moment and take action down the road to address the need for reform. Credit ratings agencies' downgrades seem abstract and intangible, but they are hugely consequential. A downgrade in our credit rating would likely cause, in effect, an automatic tax increase in the form of higher interest rates for every American who has a mortgage, a car loan, student debt, or a credit card.

The American people deserve better. Coming together in a compromise is essential now. Majority Leader REID has proposed a solution to meet all of the criteria House Republicans have demanded for weeks. It doesn't raise taxes or revenues, and it includes enough spending to meet the debt ceiling increase dollar for dollar, and it includes spending cuts that are the very same as our Republican colleagues, our friends across the aisle, have previously voted for and supported over these past weeks.

Most important, Senator REID's plan makes tough spending cuts, but it doesn't balance the budget on the backs of our seniors and our most vulnerable. It protects vital programs and doesn't make cuts to benefits, to Medicare and Social Security. Again, as I have said repeatedly, I will oppose cuts in Medicare or Social Security.

Time and again, Democrats have shown we are willing to compromise to avert catastrophe and default. Unfortunately, at every turn Republicans in the House have blocked any chance for progress and continue to put us on a very dangerous path.

I am hopeful that the deadline will produce a compromise, that the talks will be productive. But today's filibuster of our efforts to prevent a default is indeed unprecedented. As my colleague, the distinguished Senator from Maryland, pointed out a few moments ago on the floor, since March of 1962, Congress has raised the debt limit 74 times—18 times under President Reagan. During George Bush's administration, Congress passed five stand-alone debt limit increases without a filibuster or delay. And until this point, debt limit increases were routine, usually passed by a simple 51-vote majority without the procedural hurdles my Republican colleagues are using today.

Hopefully, they will come to the table to work with us to find a compromise for the good of the country and for our economic recovery. I hope my Republican colleagues will join us in achieving that result for the sake of

millions of Connecticut families, who are watching and listening, as are hundreds of millions of other Americans, and for the sake of our economy moving in the right direction. It is about jobs, jobs, jobs, the certainty our economy needs at this point in history, affordable interest rates, and moving our economy forward.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois, the assistant majority leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Connecticut for his comments and for his focus on jobs. If we ask the American people what the most important thing we face is, it is jobs, creating good-paying jobs right here in the United States so families can succeed and so our economy can grow.

I noted this morning that the President's economic adviser Gene Sperling said in the first 3 months after President Obama was sworn into office we lost 2.3 million jobs. That is what he faced walking in the door, and we have been trying to dig out of that hole ever since. I would say that, symbolically, this agreement we are working on is moving us to the point where we are having the final interment of John Maynard Keynes. He nominally died in 1946, but it appears now we are going to put him to his final rest with this agreement.

Keynes was a British economist who turned the world upside down when he started arguing that just the force of the markets is not enough to resolve problems when we face recession and depression. We need to play a more active role, a more assertive role in increasing aggregate demands by programs. One of the great disciples of that point of view was Franklin Roosevelt, who, when he came to the Presidency in the midst of the Great Depression, believed we needed to create jobs and work, infrastructure work across America to put more money into our economy. That was a positive force that helped to bring us out of the depression.

Some argue it was only a halting effort until World War II started, but the fact is, that was accepted economic theory in America for many decades. But now, take a look at where we are today. We have an obvious problem with unemployment being too high, a lack of consumer demand and confidence, and a reluctance by many Americans to make purchases of goods and services that would create a demand for more work, more jobs, and more economic growth.

The President came to office and said: Well, the first thing we need to do is to move this economy forward, and he passed a stimulus package, which I supported. I believe 40 percent of that stimulus package went into tax cuts for families so they would have more spending power, particularly lower- and middle-income families. He also put money in infrastructure, trying to

make sure we move forward building in America for our future, and money to help State and local governments that were clearly struggling with a cutback in revenue. That was the President's stimulus package. It was helpful, but it clearly did not turn the economy around as we had hoped. We are moving in the right direction.

The next thing the President did, last December, was reach a bipartisan agreement—a controversial one—to extend tax cuts in this country. The obvious belief was if we continue to put spending power in the hands of working families who have a lower propensity to save with every marginal dollar, they will spend it and help the economy get back on its feet. So that was the second phase of the stimulus.

What we are talking about now, in terms of our future—the next 10 years, and what we will do specifically for the next year and a half—is to do the opposite. It is to take money out of the economy by reducing government spending. That is a way to reduce the deficit—at least it appears to be—but yet it flies in the face of this notion that we can increase aggregate demand, increase demand for goods and services, and create jobs.

I was a member of the deficit commission—the Bowles-Simpson Commission—and that commission was very careful not to put in place the spending cuts for at least a year, until we were back on our feet and the economy was moving forward. Their fear—and the fear I share—is that if we make spending cuts at this point, it will not help economic recovery. In fact, many would agree. I think Paul Krugman regularly reports that point of view in the *New York Times*, and I think he is right.

So here we are, on the horns of a dilemma. In order to avoid the disaster that would occur August 2 if the United States defaulted on its debt for the first time in its history, we are being told we have to cut back on government spending. By cutting back on spending, we may also have a negative impact on our economy. I am afraid this dilemma is not going to serve our purposes very well. I am not sure this is clear thinking. I think, in many respects, it is ideological thinking.

The Republican point of view has always been to reduce the size of government at any cost to the economy. They believe in their heart of hearts in the pre-Keynesian view of the world: the market will work this all out if we just get out of the way. Well, that may be possible, but it is going to be a very costly experience and a costly experiment as people find themselves struggling through this recession without a helping hand.

For example, will we extend unemployment benefits as part of this conversation about what we will do with the economy for the next year and a half? I, for one, would argue we should. My understanding is they expire at the end of this year, and if that is the case,

the extension of unemployment benefits will cut off direct payments to people we know are the first dollars spent. Families on unemployment spend it all because that is what they live on. So that stimulus to the economy may be cut off.

Mrs. BOXER. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DURBIN. Let me complete one thought. Then I will be happy to yield.

Secondly, the President has put in a payroll tax cut. What that means is, working families will get about 2 percent more each pay period. The belief of the President—and I share it—is that kind of helping hand ends up with dollars in the hands of many families spent into the economy. I hope we extend the payroll tax cut as part of this agreement. It doesn't serve specifically the need for deficit reduction, but it certainly serves the need for us to stimulate the economy and have people buy more.

Right now we have a crisis of consumer confidence, and I think it is brought on by the bad news out of Washington—we have to share some of this blame—and it is brought on by the fact that many people overborrowed before the recession set in, many times going deeply into debt. For example, in the 1990s, the average indebtedness of a family was 84 percent of their annual income. By the year 2007, it had reached about 125 percent, a 15-percent increase in indebtedness. Now families facing that indebtedness are retrenching, holding back, not making commitments, and it is coming down to 112 percent and slowly back to where it should be.

What we are trying to do is to give people some spending power to create more consumer and aggregate demand for goods and services for business growth in this country.

So I hope as we look at this deficit-reduction package, as important as it is, we understand we are doing it in an economically dangerous time, when this recession still threatens us, and when many people are still holding back because of their reluctance to spend. If we do not provide a helping hand in this situation, I am afraid the economic recovery may be even slower.

The political realities tell us we are faced with this dilemma: either default on the debt ceiling or cut back in spending, either one of which would be harmful to the economy. I hope we can find a way through this that is sensible, not just from an economical point of view but a political point of view.

I yield to my colleague for a question.

Mrs. BOXER. I have a few questions because what my colleague is doing right now is stepping back and looking at the bigger economic view of where we are. Having come out of the 2010 election, where, frankly, the only issue I faced day after day was job creation, I think my friend is right to talk about that. But here we are in a crisis that is made up.

We have raised the debt ceiling 89 times, and I know my friend has looked at all of this. But isn't it true that never before have we been in a circumstance where one political party has held the full faith and credit of the United States hostage to some agenda they want to bring to the country? Is that my friend's understanding?

Mr. DURBIN. I would answer my colleague that there has never been an instance, since 1939, in the 89 times we have extended the debt ceiling—except for one technical period in 1979 for a few days—when we have used the debt ceiling as a political bargaining chip, and there has never been a time when we were this close to defaulting on the debt causing a true concern across the country and the world that the United States would not keep its promise to pay its bills, which, as the Senator knows, could result in a loss of confidence in our economy and an increase in interest rates not just for the government but for businesses and families everywhere at exactly the wrong time.

Mrs. BOXER. OK. So what we have now established is that at a time of economic uncertainty, what the Republicans have done, as a party, is hold this whole economy hostage. We have established that. It has never been done before. It is a made-up crisis. They know under Ronald Reagan the debt ceiling was raised 18 times, under George Bush it was 7, 8 or 9 times, and they never said a word. But now, in the midst of this economic crisis we have had going on, this recession, they add this horrific crisis which they have made up.

I have one more question I would like to ask my friend for his comment. I was thinking the other day how things are stalling—the economic growth and our recovery. I have looked back on this and have asked: Why has this happened.

One of the great reasons, I believe, as someone who did study economics a long time ago, is uncertainty and this whole nightmare we are going through, this unnecessary nightmare.

Here we are on a Sunday—we know talks are going on—but this is unnecessary that we are in this mess. The Republicans want us to be in this mess again in 3, 4, or 5 months. I hope we have finally gotten rid of that notion. We are not going to agree to a short-term extension. But here is what I see as the bigger picture.

As soon as the Republicans took over, they stopped working on this economy. Not only did they stop working on the FAA conference—the Federal Aviation Administration—but they now have shut down the FAA. They refuse to allow an extension, and there are job losses all over my State—I assume all over my colleague's State.

At this time they have stopped completely any work on patent reform, which Chairman LEAHY says is hundreds of thousands of jobs. They have put forward a highway bill and a budg-

et that cuts highways by one-third, which is 600,000 jobs that will be lost. They voted down, with a filibuster, MARY LANDRIEU's small business bill and my economic development bill—hundreds of thousands of jobs between those two. Now we have this made-up crisis. How long have they been in? Let's see: January, February, March, April, May, June, July—7 months, and we are in a mess.

So I say to my friend, as he puts forward this notion that we have to be concerned, it is not only that we have this made-up crisis, it is also that they have put the brakes on anything the Senate and the House can do to stimulate jobs. Does my friend agree that it is a very discouraging time?

Mr. DURBIN. Well, of course, it is. I think what is most discouraging is the average person is asking themselves: Why do we inflict this pain on ourselves in the midst of a recession? Why do we have the fear of defaulting on America's debt for the first time in our history? Why would we lose our credit rating, the best in the world—AAA—because of a manufactured political debate in Washington?

We will pay for this for a long time to come. For every 1 percent interest rates go up, our national debt goes up \$130 billion a year—\$1.3 trillion over 10 years. So as we talk about all the spending cuts we want, the fact is, we end up in a position where we can't keep up with increases in the interest rate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority time has expired.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, how much time is remaining?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The minority has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. MCCAIN. Well, I will tell you what. I will be glad to engage in a short colloquy with the Senator from Illinois, if he would like.

Does the Senator from Illinois believe we are close to an agreement?

Mr. DURBIN. I hope so.

Mr. MCCAIN. Does the Senator from Illinois agree that, most likely, that agreement will not have an increase in taxes associated with it, at least in the short term?

Mr. DURBIN. I hope not.

Mr. MCCAIN. You hope so?

Mr. DURBIN. I hope there is revenue included in any agreement.

Mr. MCCAIN. Well, everything I have heard is that the agreement does not

have tax increases in it. Has the Senator heard differently, being in the leadership?

Mr. DURBIN. I honestly am not party to this. But I can tell the Senator, as the Gang of 6 and fiscal commission, we believe everything should be under consideration to reduce our national debt.

Mr. McCAIN. So I assume that would also mean the Senator from Illinois would advocate another stimulus package?

Mr. DURBIN. I wish to make sure we have some stimulus to the economy to create jobs and help those out of work find work with training and education.

Mr. McCAIN. So one would have to assume that the Senator from Illinois believes the last stimulus package was successful, which was, counting interest, over \$1 trillion. The Senator from Illinois and others who advocated the stimulus package and the administration said: If we pass this, unemployment will be a maximum of 8 percent. This will stimulate our economy and create jobs.

Do you know what the Senator from Illinois and others are saying now? It was not enough, that it was not enough, that we didn't spend enough, that we didn't make the deficit larger. Because certainly nothing in the stimulus package was paid for. So I hope the Senator from Illinois understands—the American people understand—that just spending more money has failed and failed miserably.

When we look at the latest news, on the front page of the Wall Street Journal and the Washington Post and the New York Times, that our economy is staggering back into a situation of stagnation, and the response—I will be glad to let the Senator respond. The answer on the other side is: Well, let's have some more spending and let's raise taxes. Let's take some more money out of the taxpayers' pockets in the form of spending more money—their money. It is not the administration's money. It is not the money of the Senator from Illinois. It is the people's money. Take some more money of theirs—and this is the Nobel Prize—well, I will not—anyway. Take more money and taxes and more out of the taxpayers' pockets, and that will be the answer to our problems.

I will be glad to hear the response of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. First, I wish to thank my colleague from Arizona. For those who are witnessing this, this is almost a debate in the Senate. It rarely happens. I thank the Senator for coming to the floor.

Mr. McCAIN. May I say that rather than having the Senator use all our time, I thought I would engage in a colloquy.

Mr. DURBIN. Well, I enjoy doing this and I thank the Senator.

Mr. McCAIN. Go ahead, please.

Mr. DURBIN. First, during the course of the Senator's Presidential campaign, Mark Zandi, his economist, helped him

formulate some positions. His opinion of President Obama's stimulus is, it stopped a precipitous decline in our economy. Did it achieve all we had hoped for? No.

Mr. McCAIN. If I could interrupt on that particular point, Mr. Zandi was one of many advisers to my campaign. The key adviser was Douglas Holtz-Akin, who is, as you know, former head of the CBO—the Senator knows him well—who had no brief whatsoever for that proposal.

Please go ahead.

Mr. DURBIN. The second point I would like to ask the Senator from Arizona, I think one of the real bedrock beliefs among Republicans is that if we cut taxes, particularly on the wealthiest people in America, the economy will prosper. We hear that over and over.

Didn't we try that experiment under President George W. Bush? Didn't the debt of the United States double under the President and he left a shambles behind him, 2.3 million jobs lost in the first 3 months of President Obama's administration because of this failed economic policy which the Senator continues to espouse; that if we cut taxes on the rich, America is going to get wealthier. Haven't we tried it? Where are the jobs?

Mr. McCAIN. If I could take a little trip down memory lane with my friend from Illinois, whom I had the great privilege many years ago—I don't know if I should mention the 1982 election. He and I came to the House of Representatives together, and he might recall that one of his own, then a Democratic Congressman from Texas, got together with President Reagan and guess what we did. We cut taxes. Guess what. We had one of the strongest recoveries in recent history of this country because we didn't start spending and add spending without paying for them.

I would say to the Senator from Illinois, he is correct; the spending that went on in the previous administration was not acceptable and led to the deficit. But I would also say, speaking for myself, I voted against the Medicare Part D because it was not paid for. I voted against the earmark and porkbarrel spendings which were abundant as every appropriations bill came to the floor and dramatically increased spending in the worst way, wasteful and corrupt way, I will say. I am proud that at least some of us said: If we don't stop this spending and get it under control, then we are going to face a serious problem.

But I would also mention, and the Senator has seen the chart, it has gotten a lot worse—a lot worse—since the last election. You can't keep up B-I-O-B. You can't keep up Blame It On Bush.

Go ahead.

Mr. DURBIN. I would like to respond to my colleague from Arizona, through the Chair.

Does he recall what happened with the Reagan tax cuts? Because what

happened was we tripled the national debt during that period of time, and President Reagan came to Congress 18 times to extend the debt ceiling. He holds the record.

So to argue the Reagan tax cuts led to great long-term prosperity is seriously in doubt, if we are going to use the deficit as a measure.

Mr. McCAIN. If I could say we believed and Reagan believed that cutting tax cuts would restore our economy, which was in the tank, thanks to the practice of the previous administration before him. Reagan presided over probably one of the greatest job-creation periods in the history of this country. Those are numbers that I would be glad to insert into the RECORD.

Compare that with what has happened since this administration took office, with the promise that if we passed ObamaCare, if we passed TARP, if we passed all these others, the economy would then be restored and grow.

Again, it is hard for my dear friend from Illinois to refute the fact that it was categorically stated that if we passed the stimulus package, unemployment would be at a maximum of 8 percent.

Unemployment today is 9.2 percent, and if we look at any indicator, whether it be housing starts, whether it be the deficit, whether it be unemployed, whatever it is, it has gotten worse since the stimulus package was passed rather than better.

Mr. DURBIN. If the Senator would yield for a question.

Mr. McCAIN. I would be glad to just hear the Senator's comment.

Mr. DURBIN. I am going to give the Senator a chance to speak again.

Does the Senator believe that defaulting on our national debt for the first time in our history, which has been the threat looming over us from the House Republicans and others for a long period, is good for America's economy?

One of his colleagues on the floor from the State of Pennsylvania has come in and said: Listen, defaulting on the debt is not that big a deal. It can be, in his words, "easily managed." Does the Senator from Arizona agree with that thinking?

Mr. McCAIN. As the Senator may know, I came to the floor a couple days ago and made the comment that the Senator from Illinois and I are in agreement.

Point No. 1, we can prioritize—and every economist that I know literally would agree. We can prioritize for a while where we want what remaining money that is left. But the message we send to the world—not just our markets but to the world—that the United States of America is going to default on its debts is a totally unacceptable scenario and beneath a great nation. We are in agreement, No. 1.

Mr. DURBIN. Amen.

Mr. McCAIN. No. 2 is that to insist that any agreement is based on the

passage through the Senate of a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States, as I said before, is not fair to the American people because the terrible obstructionists on the Senator's side of the aisle, the terrible people, their flawed philosophical views about the future of America is not going to allow us to get 20 additional votes from the Senator's side, assuming you get all 47, since it required 67 votes to pass a balanced budget amendment because of the Constitution.

I think it was not only a wrong assessment; I think it is not fair to the American people to say we can pass a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution through the Senate at this time. Maybe after the Senator is defeated in the next election and we get rid of a lot of—maybe that will happen. But certainly let's not tell the American people that is a possibility because I think it raises their expectations in a way that is not fair to them and, frankly, detracts from what I think is being done as we speak between the leaders, the President, Democratic leaders and Republican leaders, which is in a very short time-frame.

Go ahead.

Mr. DURBIN. I would just say it pains me to say I agree with the Senator from Arizona, but I do.

We both feel threatening the debt ceiling is not in the best interests of the United States and both of us feel that holding out the threat that if we don't pass a constitutional amendment, we can't let the economy continue is not a good-faith bargain. I wish Senator Byrd were here to respond to that particular suggestion.

As for my prospects in the next election, I thank the Senator from Arizona for campaigning against me last time. When he did, I almost got 60 percent of the vote in Illinois. So I welcome the Senator back to the land of Lincoln anytime he would like to come.

Mr. MCCAIN. I would love to come out. As I saw, I did so well in the Presidential campaign in the land of Lincoln, I am not surprised I had such a dramatic impact on the election of the Senator from Illinois as well.

Could I just say, I think this kind of discussion is important, No. 1.

No. 2 is, we should have this national debate on other forums besides just the Sunday show, and perhaps the floor of the Senate is the best place to do that. I wish to continue to engage with the Senator from Illinois, but I hope this agreement will assure the American people that we will meet our obligations, that we will meet our obligations not only physically but fiscally but also meet our obligations to them to govern—to govern—because they did send to us here to govern. I think the Senator from Illinois would agree with me.

The last approval rating of Congress I saw, both sides of the aisle, was about 16 percent; and I have yet to encounter

anyone in that 16-percent category in my travels back to my State.

By the way, I would like to note the presence of the Budget Committee chairman, Senator CONRAD, who I think has made enormous good-faith efforts to reach an agreement on some of these issues, and I thank him for his work. I wish to assure him his reward will be in heaven, not here on Earth.

Mr. DURBIN. I would also like to thank the Senator from Arizona for the few minutes we shared on the floor. I hope more Members would do this rather than just taking turns giving speeches. These exchanges, even when we disagree, are valuable.

But I agree completely with the Senator from Arizona. At the end of the day, we cannot allow our economy to lapse into this default. It would be devastating to a lot of innocent families and businesses across America and will cost us dearly in terms of our national debt. So let us hope we can find this bipartisan agreement that people are working on, even at this moment, and I hope we can do that soon.

Incidentally, I wanted to say for the RECORD former Senator Alan Simpson, whom I came to know even better on the Bowles-Simpson commission, said:

Ronald Reagan raised taxes 11 times in his administration. I was here. I was here. I knew him better than anybody in the room. He was a dear friend and a total realist as to politics.

Mr. MCCAIN. Could I remind the Senator from Illinois that, in retrospect, the one thing President Reagan said he regretted—and he regretted it—was the agreement that was made with the Democratic leadership that we would cut spending by \$3 and increase taxes by \$1 for every cut in spending. That was the ironclad agreement. Guess what happened. We increased taxes. The fact is, we raised taxes and did not cut spending, and that was in direct violation of the commitment he got from the Democratic leadership.

I yield the floor.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WHITEHOUSE). Pursuant to rule XXII, the clerk will report the motion to invoke cloture.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the Reid motion to concur in the House amendment to S. 627, with amendment No. 589.

Harry Reid, Max Baucus, Barbara Boxer, Carl Levin, Tom Harkin, Benjamin L. Cardin, Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Patrick J. Leahy, Mark R. Warner, Patty Murray, Christopher A. Coons, Richard Blumenthal, Sherrod Brown, Kent Conrad, Mark Begich, John F. Kerry, Debbie Stabenow.

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 the motion to concur in the House amendment to S.

627 with amendment No. 589, offered by the Senator from Nevada, Mr. REID, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. KYL. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE).

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 50, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 122 Leg.]

YEAS—50

Akaka	Franken	Mikulski
Baucus	Gillibrand	Murray
Begich	Hagan	Nelson (FL)
Bennet	Harkin	Pryor
Bingaman	Inouye	Reed
Blumenthal	Johnson (SD)	Rockefeller
Boxer	Kerry	Schumer
Brown (MA)	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Brown (OH)	Kohl	Stabenow
Cantwell	Landrieu	Tester
Cardin	Lautenberg	Udall (CO)
Carper	Leahy	Udall (NM)
Casey	Levin	Warner
Conrad	Lieberman	Webb
Coons	McCaskill	Whitehouse
Durbin	Menendez	Wyden
Feinstein	Merkley	

NAYS—49

Alexander	Grassley	Nelson (NE)
Ayotte	Hatch	Paul
Barrasso	Heller	Portman
Blunt	Hoeven	Reid
Boozman	Hutchison	Risch
Burr	Isakson	Roberts
Chambliss	Johanns	Rubio
Coats	Johnson (WI)	Sanders
Coburn	Kirk	Sessions
Cochran	Kyl	Shelby
Collins	Lee	Snowe
Corker	Lugar	Thune
Cornyn	Manchin	Toomey
Crapo	McCain	Vitter
DeMint	McConnell	Wicker
Enzi	Moran	
Graham	Murkowski	

NOT VOTING—1

Inhofe

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 50 and the nays are 49. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is not agreed to.

The majority leader.

Mr. REID. I enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which cloture was not invoked.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to reconsider is entered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time until 4 p.m. be equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each during that period of time.

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the matter now before the Senate is still the pending matter we have been working on for several days. It is extremely important that everyone understands we have a message from the House, and if we are going to work something out, which we are hopeful we can do, that

we have a piece of legislation by which we can do that and not require a bunch of cloture votes. So that is where we are now. We are seeing if something can be worked out.

I have had, for the information of Senators, a number of conversations in the last hour with people downtown, and the arrangement that is being worked on with the Republican leader and the administration and others is not there yet. We are hopeful and confident it can be done. As soon as it is done, I will let my caucus know.

I have had conversations with the Republican leader and other Senators. Senators should be aware that further rollcall votes are possible today. We will do everything we can to give Members adequate notice before additional rollcall votes are scheduled.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, would the majority leader yield on that point?

Mr. REID. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. McCONNELL. If we were to vote, I assume we would have significant notice for our Members because many Members would like to leave the Capitol if we are not going to be voting.

Mr. REID. I would say to my friend that is an appropriate thing to do. I would not suggest a ball game, though; maybe closer than that.

We will give everyone adequate notice. As I indicated, we will do everything we can to give Members plenty of notice. As I indicated, we will have, on this side of the aisle, a caucus later today, whenever we are able to do that.

I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 1:39 p.m., recessed subject to the call of the Chair and reassembled at 8:31 p.m., when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mrs. SHAHEEN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

BUDGET COMPROMISE

Mr. REID. Madam President, for the last few weeks Congress has been locked in partisan gridlock. Today, I am relieved to say leaders from both parties have come together for the sake of our economy to reach a his-

toric, bipartisan compromise that ends this dangerous standoff.

The compromise we have agreed to is remarkable for a number of reasons, not only because of what it does but because of what it prevents: a first ever default on the full faith and credit of the United States.

Sometimes it seems our two sides disagree on almost everything, but in the end reasonable people were able to agree: the United States could not take the chance of defaulting on our debt, risking a United States financial collapse and a worldwide depression.

America and the world have been watching our democracy expectantly. My message to the world tonight is that this Nation and this Congress are moving forward, and we are moving forward together.

Reaching a long-term accord that would give our economy the certainty it needs was not easy. But our work is not done. Leaders from both parties and in both Chambers will present this agreement to our caucuses tomorrow. Senate Democrats will meet at 11 a.m.

To pass this settlement, we will need the support of Democrats and Republicans in both the House and the Senate. There is no way either party—either Chamber—can do this alone.

As President Lyndon Johnson said:

There are no problems we cannot solve together, and very few that we can solve by ourselves.

Democrats and Republicans have rarely needed to come together more than today. I know this agreement will not make every Republican happy. It certainly will not make every Democrat happy either. But both parties gave more ground than they wanted to, and neither side got as much as it had hoped. But that is the essence of compromise, of consensus building. And the American people demanded compromise this week, and they got it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader.

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, this is an important moment for our country. I appreciate the majority leader's comments and want to say a few words to our colleagues who have been so patient over the past several days and whose ideas and encouragement have been so helpful in getting us to this point.

First of all, let me reiterate that before any agreement is reached, Republicans will meet to discuss the framework that the White House and congressional leaders in both parties think would meet our stated efforts to cut spending more than the President's requested debt ceiling increase, prevent a national default, and protect the economy from tax increases.

To that end, I would like to say to my Republican colleagues that we will be holding a conference meeting in the

morning to discuss the framework and to give everyone a chance to weigh in. But at this point I think I can say with a high degree of confidence that there is now a framework to review that will ensure significant cuts in Washington spending. And we can assure the American people tonight that the United States of America will not for the first time in our history default on its obligations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 1448

At the request of Mr. PRYOR, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1448, a bill to exempt off-highway vehicles from the ban on lead in children's products, and for other purposes.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, AUGUST 1, 2011

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10:30 a.m. tomorrow, Monday, August 1; that following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of the motion to concur in the House message to accompany S. 627, the legislative vehicle for the debt limit increase; that the Senate recess from 11 a.m. until 12:30 p.m.; further, that at 12:30 p.m., the Senate resume consideration of the motion to concur with respect to the House message to S. 627, with the time until 2 o'clock p.m. equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Madam President, there will be a Democrat caucus at 11 a.m. tomorrow.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. REID. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 8:36 p.m., adjourned until Monday, August 1, 2011, at 10:30 a.m.