

for your consideration of this important matter.

Sincerely,

FEDERICO A. MORENO,
Chief U.S. District Judge.

Mr. LEAHY. I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask unanimous consent that the time be equally charged to both parties.

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

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today the Senate will vote on the nomination of Paul Engelmayer to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York and Ramona Villagomez Manglona to be Judge for the District Court for the Northern Mariana Islands. The seat to which Mr. Engelmayer is being considered has been deemed a judicial emergency. With this vote, we will have confirmed 29 article III judicial nominees. Eighteen have been for such judicial emergencies. Ms. Manglona's confirmation vote marks the second article IV judicial confirmation this year. I am pleased we are moving forward with filling two more vacancies.

We continue to make great progress in processing President Obama's judicial nominees. As of today, the Senate has confirmed 60 percent of President Obama's nominees since the beginning of his Presidency. That is not including the two Supreme Court Justices nominated by President Obama. As I am sure my colleagues recall, those nominations consumed a considerable amount of time in the committee and on the Senate floor.

During this Congress, the Judiciary Committee has held hearings on more than 72 percent of the President's nominees. Another hearing is scheduled to take place this Wednesday. During the comparable time period for President Bush, only 64 percent of President Bush's nominees had hearings by this time. We have also reported 64 percent of the judicial nominees, compared to only 56 percent of President Bush's nominees.

Let me say just a few words about Mr. Engelmayer and then Judge Manglona. Mr. Engelmayer graduated summa cum laude from Harvard University in 1983. He then graduated magna cum laude from Harvard Law School in 1987. Following law school, the nominee clerked for Judge Patricia Wald on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia and then for Justice Thurgood Marshall of the Supreme Court of the United States.

After his clerkships, Mr. Engelmayer joined the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Southern District of New York as an assistant U.S. attorney. In 1994, he became an assistant to the Solicitor

General of the United States. In 2000, the nominee entered private practice with Wilmer Hale and was later named Partner-in-Charge of the New York office.

The ABA Standing Committee on the Federal Judiciary has given Mr. Engelmayer a unanimous "Well Qualified" rating. I support this nomination and congratulate him on his professional accomplishments.

Now I have a few words about Judge Manglona. Judge Manglona received her bachelor of arts degree from the University of California at Berkeley in 1990. In 1996, she graduated from the University of New Mexico School of Law. Following law school, the nominee clerked for the Superior Court of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. She then worked in the Attorney General's Office and in 2002, the Governor appointed her attorney general for the Northern Mariana Islands. In 2003, she was appointed to serve as an associate judge for the Northern Mariana Islands Superior Court. During her time on the superior court, she has also served as a judge pro tem on the Guam Superior Court and the Guam Supreme Court.

The ABA Standing Committee on the Federal Judiciary has rated Judge Manglona unanimously "Qualified." I also support this nomination and congratulate her on her professional accomplishments.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. We have an unusual situation. It looks nice outside today. The Sun is shining. But earlier today, if someone looked out the window, we had some violent storms. They are all over the area. We have Senators stuck in airplanes trying to get out of New York. We have one Senator traveling from the Midwest stuck in Richmond, VA, now. I think it would be in everyone's interest—and I apologize to people who worked hard to get back here today—but I think it is in everyone's interest that we not have a vote tonight. We have a lot of people who simply would miss the vote unless we keep it open for a matter of hours. I again apologize to people who came here to vote, but I think this is the best thing to do. I have spoken to the Republican leader and this is what we should do.

I ask unanimous consent the votes scheduled for tonight be vitiated, and that on Tuesday, July 26, at 12:15 p.m., the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the nominations, Calendar Nos. 83 and 84, that there be 2 minutes for debate, equally divided in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on Calendar Nos. 83 and 84, in that order; the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any related statements be printed in the

RECORD; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant editor of the Daily Digest 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.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each. We will be in morning business until 7 o'clock tonight.

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

DEBT CEILING EXTENSION

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I ask to speak as in morning business. I certainly will not take 10 minutes that the majority leader has requested because I know the Senator from Alabama is eager to speak. I wish to make sure I understand where we are with regard to the debt ceiling.

I have an article from The Hill, dated yesterday. It points out—it heard the same thing in the speech the rest of the Nation heard when the President spoke—the President said he would be willing to work on any plans lawmakers brought to him over the weekend. The President went on to say:

The only bottom line I have is that we have to extend this debt ceiling through the next election, into 2013.

I ask my colleagues what does the election of 2012 have to do with the debt ceiling? What does it have to do with deciding to pay our obligations after August 2? What does it have to do with avoiding the calamity we have all heard about from both sides of the aisle and certainly from the administration? It strikes me as very odd that most debt ceiling extensions have been about 7 months during a decade-long period, and for some reason because of the election of 2012, the President of the United States wants to extend the deadline past that election into 2013. I think it makes Americans wonder if the President is playing politics with this very important issue.

The President went on to say in the press conference that we all listened to that he wondered if the Republicans were able to say yes to any agreement. That was the President on Friday evening. Now we come to Washington, DC today with the clock ticking, 8 days away from a supposed debacle, and I read in today's Wall Street Journal

this report by Jamie Dupree, President Obama last night rejected a bipartisan deal offered to him by congressional leaders of both parties which would have provided for a short-term extension of the debt limit in order to avoid a U.S. Government default. The agreement involved Speaker BOEHNER, Senate Majority Leader REID, and Senate GOP Leader MCCONNELL. In fact, according to this Wall Street Journal article, staffers from Senator REID and Senator MCCONNELL's offices were working on the legislative language together on Sunday. When REID took the bipartisan, bicameral plan down to the White House, it was rejected by the President.

I ask my colleagues: Who is unable to say yes? The Democratic majority leader of this body said yes to a bipartisan agreement. The Republican Speaker of the House of Representatives, the leader of that majority in the other body, said yes to an agreement. Senator REID's colleague and friend, the Republican leader, Senator MCCONNELL, said yes to a bipartisan agreement, and then Senator REID was given the task of taking it to the President of the United States and the President rejected it.

I think Americans have a right to ask who is unable to say yes to a bipartisan deal that gets us out of this box. Who is playing politics with this issue? The public debt is \$14.2 trillion. We meet the deadline a week from tomorrow. The clock is ticking. The President had an opportunity to say yes to a bipartisan agreement endorsed by the leadership of this Congress and yet he said no. I am calling on this President, on my President, to do the right thing by the American people and to do the right thing for our country and for our economy and ask this bipartisan group of leaders to come back to the White House and say yes to the agreement which they offered him last night.

I thank the President. I thank the Senator from Alabama for allowing me to go in front of him.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I know we have talked about having an opportunity to digest and analyze and score any kind of proposal. I understand this afternoon the majority leader, Senator REID, said he would propose legislation tonight and file cloture tonight, and that would, according to the rules of the Senate, move this vote up to early Wednesday morning. That would give us only tomorrow, 1 day, to digest a bill that would impact our spending trajectory for the next decade. I would ask my experienced colleague, who was a distinguished Member of the House and now in the Senate, does that cause him concern?

Mr. WICKER. I think absolutely it should cause concern and this is something both parties have campaigned on in the past, the lack of transparency, the lack of time, things being rushed through at the last minute. But my larger point is that on Friday after-

noon the President was calling for a plan, any plan. He said there was only one condition: We must be political about it. We must get past the presidential reelection in 2012. Then on Sunday night not just any plan was presented to the President but a bipartisan plan by both leaders in this body on behalf of their membership and the Republican Speaker of the House who said, we believe we can get this through, and the President rejected it out of hand. That is the larger point.

The point of the Senator from Alabama is well taken. The legislative language is important. The agreement in concept is one thing, but as he is pointing out, the legislative language is also important. As ranking member of the Budget Committee, he knows full well Members need time to see if the language actually reduced the concepts into writing that can be enforced and work long term to get us out of this horrendous debt crisis we are in. I appreciate the Senator's point.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the Senator. I appreciate that. The point the Senator made is tremendously important. All year we have conducted Senate business, with regard to the financial future of our country, in the most troubling way. It is unlike anything we have done in our history. I would say from a structural, systemic circumstance, this Nation has never had a more serious debt problem. We are borrowing 40 cents of every dollar we spend. Yes, we do have a war going on that is costing \$150 billion this year. But the deficit this year will be \$1.5 trillion. It is not the war. That is only about 10 percent of our deficit, unfortunately.

Back in World War II, we could see our way out of the war and into our victory, and we saw great growth in the future. But the deficits we are now accruing every day, every week, every month are significant because they are going to be hard to change. We are spending more than we take in and we have got to change. We can change. If we do change we will get this country back on a growth path.

I have repeatedly warned against avoiding the normal budget process this year, a process required by law but that this Senate under the Democratic leadership explicitly refused to do—the majority leader said it would be foolish to produce a budget. We are now about 820 days or so without a budget. For over 2 years we have not had a budget for the United States of America, and they never even attempted to move a budget even though a law says we should pass one by April 15. Well, it doesn't put anybody in jail. Maybe that is what it should have done. Maybe a bunch of people would be in jail today. Maybe we would have a budget if we had some teeth in the axe. It is the statute of the United States that requires we have a budget and we do not have one.

Then we begin to hear the warnings 6 months ago that we would reach a

point where we would need to raise the debt limit, the debt ceiling we have. Congress has said: Mr. President, you can borrow money, but only so much. You cannot borrow more than the amount, \$14-some-odd trillion, that is all. If you need to borrow more, Congress will have to approve it. We have the power of the purse under the Constitution.

This has been brewing for some time. I have been warning about this, since we have not done our job, since the Budget Committee has not met about these issues, the Appropriations Committee has not met about these issues, the Finance Committee has not met about the tax and mandatory entitlement programs that are under their jurisdiction. No work has been done all year. None. We are told not to worry, our leaders are going to meet a few times in secret. This little group failed, and this group with the Vice President met and that didn't work. Then they are going to meet with the President, and that didn't work. Finally, last night, as Senator WICKER said, it did appear an agreement was reached between the Democratic leadership and the Republican leadership on a bill that at least would get us past this debt crisis. They had the leadership agreement. I have not read it. I do not know what is in it. I am going to know what is in the bill. I have a constitutional responsibility, as do the other 99 Senators here, to make a good judgment on it.

It is odd that after all of that a bipartisan agreement was reached, and the President walked away from it. Now he is going to blame Speaker BOEHNER, who produced a budget. The Republican House produced a far-reaching, historic budget that would actually change the debt trajectory of our country and put us on the right path, the path to restoring prosperity and the creation of jobs. This debt is so large it is a wet blanket, as Speaker BOEHNER said. I called it an anchor, a weight that is pulling down the economy, as expert economists have told us. Not just me. Experts tell us that when you have this much debt, you lose 1 million jobs a year that would otherwise be created.

We have a serious problem, and I am not pleased about it. I felt all along that this is exactly what was going to happen. Somewhere in the back of the minds of the President or the leaders or somebody was the idea that they would bring up a plan at the eleventh hour, fiftieth minute, bring it to the floor of the Senate, and say: If you don't vote it, Members of the Senate, if you don't vote for it, Members of the House, we are going to have a debt crisis and it will all be your fault. Well, I am not interested in that. I am not going to vote for any kind of significant legislation, as this is, until I have had a chance to read it and think about it. Majority Leader REID told us of his plan this afternoon and he told us not to worry, he has a 1-page summary. Trust us. He is going to introduce legislation tonight and we will vote

Wednesday morning, and it will be good for America. Just do what I tell you and go along and mind your manners and we will get this thing taken care of. Trust me.

Well, the American people have been trusting Washington too long. The American people know there is no justification whatsoever in this country for spending so much money that 40 percent of every dollar we spend has to be borrowed. They know better. They know we have no business spending \$3,700 billion when we take in only \$2,200 billion. That is what happened in this last election. They said: Oh, these tea party people, they are not good Americans. They are angry. They are mad. That is not good. You are bad people. Well, give me a break. Why shouldn't they be? If we had a recall election, we all ought to be voted out of office, I suppose. There is no way we should ever have been in this situation.

Now under the pressure of the American people and fear of the next election, why did the President reject this bipartisan agreement? Well, it would require us to meet again next year. We will need to talk about more cuts because the cuts they are talking about are clearly insufficient to meet the challenge we are facing today—clearly insufficient. We have to do more.

So if a person runs up their credit card too much and they hit the limit and they want the limit raised, the person who is loaning the money—the American people—would like to know, have you changed your habits? Are you going to do better? Let's see a plan—a budget—a plan that gets us out of this fix. That has been steadfastly rejected by the leadership in this Senate all year, and we knew we were heading to this date. So Senator REID is throwing something out there. Let's talk a little bit about what appears to be in it.

The President has had a friendly press on most of the things he has proposed. He proposed a budget—the Democratic Senate never produced one, but by law the President has to produce one. Every President has to produce one every year. So the President produced one this year. The lowest annual deficit in that budget would be \$740 billion. The highest deficit President Bush ever had was \$450 billion, and he was criticized for that. The lowest he would have in 10 years was \$750 billion, and in the 10th year it was back over \$1 trillion, according to the Congressional Budget Office's analysis of his budget. So that is where we are heading. That is the kind of thing the President has submitted to us.

Do my colleagues know what he said about it? He said: I am proud of my budget. It will have America living within its means.

Can we believe the President of the United States said that—that a budget with a lowest annual deficit of over \$700 billion was living within our means?

He also said, "It would add no more to our debt." And his budget director,

Mr. Jack Lew, said the same thing. He actually testified to that effect before the Budget Committee. It was breathtaking.

So forgive me if I am not buying into a proposal based on one page. It was produced this afternoon. It said we are going to reduce the deficit by \$2.7 trillion. Forgive me if I am not buying into that until I see it and it has been scored. That is what I think ought to happen here today.

By the way, we have heard the debates—and Speaker BOEHNER used this phrase and others have used it: we want to have dollar for dollar spending reduction to debt limit increase. What that means is that if we increase the debt ceiling and allow the government to borrow another \$1 trillion, we should cut spending by \$1 trillion. That is just a rough idea. I don't know how they came up with that. That is what they came up with.

Remember, the debt is still going up every year because we are still spending more than we take in. This is like Wimpy in the old "Popeye" cartoon. Wimpy said: Give me a hamburger today, and I will pay you tomorrow. So we are going to get the immediate ability to borrow \$1 trillion, \$2 trillion more, raising the debt limit that much, on a promise that we will reduce spending by that amount over 10 years—not 1 year but 10 years.

This is a dangerous process. This is the kind of rhetoric that has put us in the position we are in today, which is that 40 cents of every dollar we spend is borrowed. It is what is threatening the financial future of our country, this kind of thinking in Washington, and we have to change that. We have to be honest about our numbers. As the ranking Republican on the Budget Committee, I feel an obligation. And our staff is eager to see the legislative language, not a one-page outline, about what will actually happen with our spending. We want to be sure the promises made with this bill are more accurate than the ones President Obama made when he said his budget would call for us to live within our means when it plainly does not.

I will mention a couple of things at this point that jump out at me from the one-page outline we have seen.

Majority Leader REID says his plan would produce savings of \$2.7 trillion, but really it appears to represent a \$1.2 trillion or so reduction in discretionary spending, and the rest of it is accrued in other ways. Speaker BOEHNER's proposal has discretionary spending reductions of about the same, but what is obvious is that Speaker BOEHNER's commission would reduce spending more and has a target, a goal to reach an additional \$1.8 trillion. The one produced by Senator REID, on the other hand, mentions a commission, but has no reduction in spending as a requirement of that commission. They don't have any obligation to produce a reduction in spending.

What else is in there? Another factor is that we are now drawing down the

cost of our military efforts in Afghanistan and Iraq. Last year, we spent a little over \$150 billion. This year, we will spend a little over \$100 billion. The plan is to at least be down to \$50 billion in 2 or 3 years. So over the 10-year period, there will be about 8 years, nearly, at \$50 billion or so spent on the war instead of \$150 billion. That is part of the plan we have been operating on for a long time. So \$150 billion for the war is not a baseline projection of the United States. It was never projected to continue at that level. So hopefully we can bring it below \$50 billion. Maybe we won't get to \$50 billion; I don't know. But what is the reasonable estimate? I think the House Republicans and the President said it would drop to \$50 billion, so that should be the baseline projection for the rest of the time. That is \$1 trillion total. So if we take \$1 trillion out of the \$2.7 trillion in savings, we are down to \$1.7 trillion in savings.

Another thing is that since the \$1 trillion is war-related spending, as Mr. REID wants it, it is not a real reduction from baseline spending. It is always considered to be extra, war-related emergency spending. And he claims interest savings on this money as another \$200 billion. So now we have about \$1.2 trillion right there, overstating his cuts through the elimination of the war. Speaker BOEHNER does not do that. His numbers are far more accurate and honest and realistic.

I also would like to point out that when we talk about spending and how we measure it, we have to know what the baseline is. One reason this country is broke and is in financial crisis is because we claim we are cutting spending when we are actually increasing spending.

The way it works is the Congressional Budget Office produces an assumption that we will increase spending at the rate of inflation or some other rate over a period of years. Then, if we reduce that rate of spending increase a little bit, politicians claim they have produced savings, that they have cut spending. But spending is not really reduced. Spending is still going up. There are various baselines out there that are used to calculate this, and it is very significant over 10 years and even more so over 20 years. So we hear people saying: We are cutting spending under this plan. So for Speaker BOEHNER or Senator REID, either one of those plans, I am confident will show we are spending a good bit more money in the 10th year than we are spending today.

This is confusing to the American people. I am really convinced the only way we can honestly compare the plans is to go back to basics—the way families do it: Do you increase your spending or not, based on what you spent last year? You take a flat level, and how much do you increase it over the next year, 2 years, 10 years? How much does it go up? That is the way to do it. Then we can compare plans. Then we

can see what Speaker BOEHNER has, what Congressman RYAN has in his budget plan for 10 years. Senator TOOMEY proposed a very thoughtful 10-year budget plan that balanced our budget in 10 years. That was not easy to do, but he did it. We need to be thinking like that and get away from this confusing mishmash, which we use to claim that we are saving \$1 trillion when really nobody plans for us to be spending \$150-plus billion on the war in Iraq and Afghanistan for the next 10 years. That money has never been projected to be spent in that fashion.

So we are in a situation where it is important for the country to reach an agreement and we need to pass something that raises the debt ceiling for America. I hate to say that, but it is a fact. It would be too disruptive not to do that. But, in exchange for that, as a part of that process, we truly need to start bringing our house into financial order. We are in disarray and discord, but if we were to do that, we could leave this a better country for our children and grandchildren.

I know some just want to increase spending and then raise taxes to pay for it. The Defense Department last year got about a 2-percent increase, a 3-percent increase. Next year, there is projected to be a 2-percent increase in some of the budget numbers. It might not happen because we don't have even that much money.

But we know how much nondefense discretionary spending increased during this time of record deficits under President Obama's leadership, not counting the almost \$900 billion in stimulus money. Baseline, nondefense discretionary spending increased 24 percent between 2008 and 2010, and now we are seeing the biggest deficits ever. President Bush never had any increases in baseline spending like that—never. It is just stunning.

There was a huge Democratic majority in the Senate and in the House, and the President wanted his investments, and he got these huge increases, and now they want to raise taxes to pay for it and keep it up there and maintain it. We can't afford to maintain that level. We have to bring it back down to 2009, 2008, 2007 levels. The country is not going to go bankrupt—broke—and people are not going to be thrown into the streets if we return to those levels of spending. If we make some tough choices, the same way cities and counties and families are doing all over America, we can get this house in order. That is what we are going to have to do.

I look forward to studying plans put forward by the majority leader and to studying the plan put forward by Speaker BOEHNER. The American people need time to know what is in them and what they mean to us in terms of taxing and spending, deficits, and interest payments. And then Congress needs to have time to vote on it.

Again, I repeat my deep frustration that we have not conducted this in

open, public debate for months now, utilizing the established Senate procedure of regular order. Instead, we have attempted to solve this big problem in secret, behind closed doors, with just a few people. I believe that is contrary to the historical understanding of the role of Congress, and I am not happy about it. I oppose it, I object to it, and I expect to have an appropriate amount of time to consider whatever plan comes forward.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, this weekend, driving around the Twin Cities, I was listening to public radio. The host of the program introduced a Republican member of the House Budget Committee. The member, whom I will not name to spare him or her a great deal of embarrassment, was asked about the consequences of not raising the debt ceiling.

The member assured the host and listeners that failing to raise the debt ceiling would not create a default for a number of reasons. Among them was, according to this member, we can pay out all the Social Security checks to seniors because—and I quote—"the money is in the trust fund."

Well, of course, there is \$2.6 trillion of assets in the trust fund, but the Social Security trust fund is composed entirely of Treasury notes. Allow me to quote from the Congressional Research Service:

By law, Social Security revenues credited to the trust fund . . . are invested in non-marketable U.S. government obligations. These obligations are physical (paper) documents issued to the trust fund and held by the Social Security Administration. When the obligations are redeemed, the Treasury must issue a check (a physical document) to the Social Security trust fund for the interest earned on the obligations.

CRS continues:

However, unlike a private trust that may hold a variety of assets and obligations of different borrowers, the Social Security trust fund can hold only non-marketable U.S. government obligations. The sale of these obligations by the U.S. government to the Social Security trust fund is federal government borrowing (from itself) and counts against the federal debt limit.

Now, I have no idea what this Republican member of the House Budget Committee believes is in the Social Security trust fund. Stacks of hundred-dollar bills? Gold bricks? Warehouses of freezers with steaks in them?

To me, it is shocking—shocking—that a Member of Congress—let alone a member of the House Budget Committee—can be so wildly ignorant of the basic workings of our government. We come to Washington to work together to solve our Nation's problems. How are we to do that if Members are unwilling or unable to come to even the most rudimentary understanding of our government?

None of us is immune to making mistakes. Yet we find ourselves in this moment of existential crisis, with the full

faith and credit of the United States being held hostage by a menagerie of ideologues who invent their own realities and are only too happy to share these fantasies with an unsuspecting public.

We are playing with disaster. Can we please just stick to the facts? The fact is, if we do not act immediately, we will see a downgrade of our credit rating and possibly even default on our debt. Both would be entirely counterproductive to our goal of shrinking our deficits and growing our economy. We cannot control the fantasies of clueless ideologues, but we must act responsibly and do our jobs. And we must do it now.

I suggest 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 that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

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

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6 p.m., recessed subject to the call of the Chair and reassembled at 7:21 p.m. when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. BLUMENTHAL).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, thank you very much for your patience and also for being willing to be here when most are doing other things.

SHARED SACRIFICE IN RESOLVING THE BUDGET DEFICIT—Resumed

Mr. REID. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the pending business.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1323) to express the sense of the Senate on shared sacrifice in resolving the budget deficit.

Pending:

Reid amendment No. 529, to change the enactment date.

Reid amendment No. 530 (to amendment No. 529), of a perfecting nature.

Reid motion to commit the bill to the Committee on Finance, with instructions, Reid amendment No. 531, of a perfecting nature.

Reid amendment No. 532 (to the instructions (amendment No. 531) of the motion to commit), of a perfecting nature.

Reid amendment No. 533 (to amendment No. 532), of a perfecting nature.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to vitiate the action with respect to the pending amendments and motion to commit relative to S. 1323.