

Hutchison	McCain	Sessions
Inhofe	McCaskill	Shaheen
Isakson	McConnell	Shelby
Johanns	Menendez	Snowe
Johnson (SD)	Merkley	Stabenow
Johnson (WI)	Moran	Tester
Kerry	Murkowski	Thune
Kirk	Nelson (NE)	Toomey
Klobuchar	Nelson (FL)	Udall (CO)
Kohl	Paul	Udall (NM)
Kyl	Portman	Vitter
Landrieu	Pryor	Warner
Lee	Reed	Webb
Lieberman	Roberts	Whitehouse
Lugar	Rockefeller	Wicker
Manchin	Rubio	Wyden

NAYS—12

Akaka	Lautenberg	Murray
Durbin	Leahy	Reid
Harkin	Levin	Sanders
Inouye	Mikulski	Schumer

NOT VOTING—1

Risch

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for passage, the bill is passed.

The Senator from Colorado is recognized.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 2:15 p.m. the Senate proceed to a period of morning business with Senator COBURN being recognized for up to 20 minutes; that following Senator COBURN, Senator MIKULSKI be recognized for up to 15 minutes; and that following Senator MIKULSKI's remarks, the majority leader be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

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

Thereupon, the Senate, at 1 p.m., recessed and reassembled at 2:15 p.m. when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. WEBB).

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I understand that I have 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

STATUTORY DEBT LIMIT

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I want to speak on two or three topics, the first of which is the statutory debt limit.

We heard the Treasury Secretary today say that essentially early, late July would be the last time at which we could manipulate things to not surpass our debt limit. I wanted to ask the rhetorical question: What does the statutory debt limit mean? What it means is we put into law a limitation on ourselves on the amount of money we can borrow.

President Bush—I believe my facts are correct—asked for the debt limit to be extended seven times. This will be the second under President Obama's leadership. It has been extended multitudes of times prior to that. As a physician I am querying myself to ask the question: Why do we put a limit on our debt when every time it comes up, we raise the limit again? The answer to that question is the limit does not mean anything because we continue to disregard the difficulty we are in. If a debt limit meant something, we would make changes and take actions to limit the amount of money we are spending so we would not break the debt limit or have to raise the debt limit.

As a physician, when I think about the debt limit, the debt limit is a symptom of simply another problem. That other problem is that we in Congress—this Congress, the Congress before this, and the 10, 20 Congresses before that—have not taken seriously the idea that this country has to live within its means. In fact, we are not living within our means. We were not living within our means before the housing crisis of 2008. We were not living within our means except one short period of time when we had a true net surplus of about \$36 billion, thanks to the tech bubble and the fact that in 1995, the 104th Congress did a rescission package of a significant amount, under \$30 billion, but the accumulated benefit of that allowed us to run those surpluses.

The question before our country today is: Is the Congress going to pass another debt limit? Are we going to raise the debt limit again and not do what every other family, every other business, and every other organization in this country has to do and, in fact, the rest of the world? And that is, they do not have the liberty of spending money they do not have on things they do not absolutely need.

I believe the question the American people ought to be asking of Congress and this President is: How dare you even consider raising the debt limit until you have done a thorough job of finding out whether the programs—the multitudes, hundreds of thousands of programs—we have actually function efficiently, actually do their intended purpose and, in fact, are a legitimate role for the Federal Government to be doing in the first place?

We are always going to have the partisan debate on whether taxes are not high enough or spending is not low enough. But all of those belie the real problem, which is this country cannot continue to live beyond its means.

In point of fact that this Congress does not want to do that, we have a small business bill on the floor about which we are all tied up in knots because we do not want to make votes that actually will cut \$20 billion worth of spending this year. We do not want to have those votes. We have had all these shenanigans to try to keep from coming to the floor amendments that actually do something.

The American people ought to look at us and say: What is going on? Do you not get it? Do you not understand that the country as a whole is now experiencing what a large number of our families did over the last 2 years, that the amount coming in is less than the amount going out and adjustments in how we spend and what we spend have to be made?

We have an ethanol amendment that I understand is controversial. The fact is, it will be voted on after cloture is filed on this bill. But it is an amendment that will save a true \$4.9 billion this year alone. The money for that tax credit that goes to the international and national oil companies in this country to blend ethanol with fuel—they sent a letter and said they do not want the money. How does one justify voting to send money, \$4.9 billion, to ExxonMobil and Chevron and ConocoPhillips and all the rest of the big ones that are going to show tremendous profits with oil prices where they are today? When they say they do not want it, how does one justify continuing to send money to them? How does one vote against not sending that money back to the Treasury, not borrowing the money from the Chinese to pay the large oil companies to blend ethanol?

It is not a justification. The reason we are not having a vote is because they know it will be adopted. That amendment will be adopted. That is why we are not having a vote.

America ought to look at the Senate and say: You are not having a vote on something that will save America almost \$5 billion this year, before the end of this year that the people who are getting that money do not want and have written to the Congress and said, We do not want the money, and yet we are not going to be allowed to take that amendment up in regular order and not be able to have a vote on it because a small special interest group does not want that to happen?

Talk about dysfunctional. Talk about having our heads in the sand. Talk about not addressing the real problem with the debt limit when we cannot even do something that simple, of saving the American people \$5 billion on one amendment and we will not do it? Some real change has to happen, and not enough change has happened yet.

The Government Accountability Office issued a report a month ago outlining massive duplication throughout our government, the first third of it with massive amounts of duplication. The question on the other side is: Are these legitimate roles for the Federal Government? We are not even going to debate that issue. The fact is, they showed massive amounts of duplication in large areas across the government in which we have multiple programs to do the exact same thing.

We have an amendment that will save \$5 billion this year if we will vote on the amendment and say, Let's cut \$5 billion out of at least \$50 billion to \$100

billion we know is there, and let's do it this year, and let's have the administration mandate they have to do it.

That is another \$5 billion. In two amendments, we would have covered everything we would have cut with the CRs. They are common sense. They match what the American people want us to do. If we had true world bankers, they would be telling us to do it as well. And yet we have not been able to achieve a vote on that amendment.

Then we have the fact that we have unemployed millionaires to the tune of taking, I believe the number is, \$20 million in unemployment checks—people earning \$1 million a year taking \$20 million from the taxpayers of this country for unemployment. We should not let that go on one second longer. Unemployment is for people who desperately need it. It is not for those who do not.

What we have also found is the tremendous cost, as we researched the data on the unemployment for millionaires, that we are spending almost \$5 billion a year to manage the unemployment program in this country at the Federal level, when 85 to 90 percent of the work is done at the State level. We did not even offer that amendment to downsize that activity.

The suggestion I have for my colleagues is let's go back to the debt extension, the statutory debt limit. I am of a mind—and I think the average American, regardless of what the consequences are and all the fear mongering we hear about, oh, you have to do this, you have to do this—I do not think we should do it until we have followed some of the commonsense prescriptions that the average family does in this country before we extend the debt limit. My knowledge of the functioning of this town says it is doubtful we will ever do that.

I call on my colleagues to start thinking about what the real disease is in Washington. The real disease is we do not have the courage to make the very hard choices that are in front of our country today and then live with the results of that in terms of how it is going to impact our political careers.

Everybody has a program they want to protect. The message for America today is every program is going to get hit. The Defense Department is going to get hit. Every program is going to get hit. My taxes are going to go up. Sorry, they are going to go up. This country cannot get out of this mess with the behavior we are exhibiting in this body. And if we fail to do what is necessary for our country at this critical time in our juncture, history will deem us absolutely incompetent.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

THE BUDGET

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, my colleague has talked about the disease in Washington, but I want to talk

about another disease that seems to be running rampant in the House Republican caucus, and that is hypocrisy. Hypocrisy. The reason I say that is they say one thing and they mean another. They say one thing and they deceive the American public.

Ordinarily, I would not comment on the behavior or the tribal mores of the House Republican caucus, but they have had a field day on TV ridiculing the Senate, ridiculing the Democratic Senate, essentially doing a lot of name calling. I am not doing name calling. I am going to do fact describing.

The reason I call it hypocrisy is this: What they say they want to do, which is reduce government spending, they do not. They only do it on particular groups of people.

The other is something called the consequences of the shutdown. Let me say this: They want to cut spending, but they are unwilling to cut their own pay. Sure, I am for a government that is more frugal. I am for cuts. But I am not for their cuts. What they propose is reckless and radical, and when they do not get their own way, they say: Cut it or shut it.

However, I take this position: If there is a government shutdown, I do not think Members of Congress should be paid. If there is a government shutdown and we tell dedicated Federal employees that they are not going to get paid, that they are nonessential, the fact that we could not stop a shutdown shows we are not essential. I believe if there is a shutdown, Members of Congress should not get paid. I not only want to express that as a sentiment, I did that backing Senator BARBARA BOXER's bill which passed the Senate that said if there is a shutdown, Members of Congress do not get paid.

What did the House Republicans do? They passed a bill, I will not go through the details, but on this relevant section they said Members of Congress and the President do not get paid. But guess what. They allow for retroactive payment. The Senate bill does not do that. So they would be the only ones in a shutdown who can come back and pick up that little paycheck they have stuck in a corner. Talk about hypocrisy. That is called bait and switch. It ought to be under some kind of consumer protection law.

Even the title of their bill is wrong. Their bill is called the Government Shutdown Prevention Act. Their bill doesn't stop a shutdown. It doesn't even help with the sitdown. What is a sitdown? We would come to the table as grownup Americans, and we would try to arrive at how to pass a continuing resolution to fund the government that recognizes not only debt but that there are certain aspects of the government programs we need to be able to fund.

My constituents were outraged when Wall Street executives got hundreds of millions of dollars in bonuses. They should be outraged when, as Members of Congress, we are going to get paid when they do not.

Here is what I don't get. My home State is the home of the National Institutes of Health. Right now I have thousands of people working as a team to find the cure for Alzheimer's, for AIDS, for autism, for cancer. We race for the cure, and we should, but we are going to tell those researchers they are nonessential.

Right now there are thousands of Federal employees processing the claims of Social Security, making sure someone who is disabled qualifies for their benefit. They are going to be told they are nonessential.

Let me tell you, on any given day, if somebody, in whatever town they live, goes to their Social Security office and finds it shuttered and they cannot apply for a benefit for which they believe they are eligible, I think they would rather shut us down than that Social Security office be shut down.

Ask anybody in the United States of America who they think is more essential, Members of Congress or the researchers working on a cure for cancer or those people working to defend our borders. I could give example after example; you know where they are.

It is very clear people know they depend, for the functioning of the Federal Government, on a civil service that is honest, that has integrity, counseling us to make sure we keep government doors open while we negotiate the numbers. Numbers do matter. I am ready to come to the table. I believe all Democrats are ready to come to the table. But we will not come to the table to engage in meaningless discussions and pursuing a way that is reckless.

I will discuss about the recklessness more, but I want everybody to understand Democrats in the Senate passed a bill that said if there is a shutdown, we don't get paid, no way, no day, and no backpay. So no way, no backpay. The House, in the meantime, did this sham scam that says: Yes, we will pretend we are not getting paid, but we are going to pick up a backpayment.

I don't get these guys. They want to take away Medicare and turn it into a voucher program, but they are sure happy picking up government health care. They love getting federally subsidized health care. They want to take away other people's pensions, but they sure like getting their Federal employee pensions. I am going to put an end to the hypocrisy, and I am going to put an end to the CR dangling.

I think we need to come to the table and pass a responsible budget that recognizes we are in a frugal era and we need to make sure the American people know we are on their side. At the same time, the American people need to know that many of us are willing to say if a shutdown comes and Federal employees get no pay and contractors get no pay, we get no pay and no backpay.

I will have more to say about this as this week unfolds, but before I sit down, please, let's sit down rather than shut down.