

I expect the President to include ideas from Democrats and from Republicans. For 3 years, the President has reached out to Republicans. Now is the time to work with him on common ideas to produce legislation, not stalemate. I ask my Republican colleagues to give his bipartisan vision the consideration it deserves.

In 1947, President Truman delivered the first televised State of the Union Message. Truman was the 20th President to govern alongside a Congress controlled by the opposing party. The first was George Washington. He said Democrats in the executive branch and Republicans in the legislative branch could and should work hand in hand to shape the Nation. This is what he said:

There are ways of disagreeing; men who differ can still work together sincerely for the common good.

I hope Republicans in Congress will keep those words in mind tonight. Despite all our differences, together we can build an economy that works for the common good of all Americans.

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

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

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

THE PRESIDENT'S POLICIES

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, tonight the President of the United States will come to the Capitol to give us his sense of the state of the Union. This is a venerable tradition, and we welcome him. Yet it is hard not to feel a sense of disappointment even before tonight's speech is delivered because while we do not yet know all the specifics, we do know the goal. Based on what the President's aides have been telling reporters, the goal is not to conquer the Nation's problems, it is to conquer Republicans. The goal is not to prevent gridlock but to guarantee it.

Here is how the New York Times summed up the President's election-year strategy in a recent article entitled "Obama to Turn Up Attacks on Congress in Campaign." Here is the quote:

In terms of the president's relationship with Congress in 2012 . . . the president is no longer tied to Washington, D.C.

According to the story, winning a full-year extension of the cut in payroll taxes is the last—the last—"must do" piece of legislation for the White House.

Here is how a White House aide described the President's election-year strategy just a couple of weeks ago, presumably just as tonight's speech was being drafted. Referring to past displays of bipartisanship, he said:

[Then] we were in a position of legislative compromise by necessity. That phase is behind us. . . .

So, as I see it, the message from the White House is that the President has basically given up. He got nearly everything he wanted from Congress for the first 2 years of his Presidency. The results are in. It is not good. So he has decided to spend the rest of the year trying to convince folks that the results of the economic policies he put in place are somehow Congress's fault and not his.

Well, my message is this: This debate is not about what Congress may or may not do in the future, it is about what this President has already done. The President's policies are now firmly in place. It is his economy now. We are living under the Obama economy. The President may want to come here tonight and make it sound as if he just somehow walked in the door. A better approach is to admit that his 3-year experiment in big government has made our economy worse and our Nation's future more uncertain and it is time for a different approach. That is the message the American people delivered to the President in November of 2010, and they are still waiting.

The President will tell the American people tonight that he has a blueprint for the economy. What he will fail to mention is that we have been working off the President's blueprint now for 3 years—for 3 years. And what has it gotten us? Millions still looking for work, trillions in debt, and the first credit downgrade in U.S. history.

The President will propose ideas tonight that sound good and have bipartisan support. If he is serious about these proposals, if he really wants to enact them, he will encourage Democrats who run the Senate to keep them free from poison pills such as tax hikes on job creators that we know from past experience turn bipartisan support into bipartisan opposition.

If the President wants someone to blame for this economy, he should start with himself. The fact is, any CEO in America with a record like this after 3 years on the job would be graciously shown the door. This President blames the managers instead. He blames the folks on the shop floor. He blames the weather.

Well, you are certainly within your rights to walk away from the legislative process if you like, Mr. President. You can point the finger all you like. But you cannot walk away from your record.

I saw a survey the other day that contained a number of sobering findings. It was a poll of small business leaders. It said that more than 8 out of 10 of them now believe the U.S. economy is on the wrong track. Eight in

ten said they would rather have Washington stay out of the way than try to help them. Nearly 9 out of 10 said they would rather have more certainty from Washington than assistance. And it said that nearly one-third of all those surveyed said they are not hiring on account of the health care bill. One-third of them said they were not hiring on account of the health care bill. What this survey says to me is that the policies of this administration are literally crushing—crushing—the private sector. They are stifling job creation, and they are holding the economy back.

Americans want Washington to get out of the way. Yet this President continues to have the same two-word answer he has always had for seemingly every single problem we face: more government. And this is the economy we have to show for it.

Last week, the President had an opportunity to do something on his own about the ongoing jobs crisis. The only thing that stood in the way of the single biggest shovel-ready infrastructure project in America was him. The Keystone Pipeline was just the kind of project he had been calling for in speeches for months, and he said no; that one could wait. Here is a project he knew would create thousands of jobs instantly. He said no. A project that would not have cost taxpayers a dime. He said no. That would have brought more energy from our ally Canada and less from the Middle East. He said no. It all came down to one question: Was the Keystone Pipeline in the national interest? He said no.

As one columnist put it, his own standard was not the national interest, it was his own political interest. Americans want jobs, and the President is studying an election that took place 60 years ago to see how he can save his own job.

He sided with the liberal environmental base over the energy and security interests of the American people. That is exactly what we are now being told we can expect for the rest of the year.

In last year's State of the Union, the President talked about how we need to win the future—win the future. This year he just wants to win the next campaign. The President can decide he is not interested in working with Congress if his party only controls one-half of it. That is his prerogative. He can give up on bipartisanship, but we will not; our problems are too urgent. The economy is too weak. The future is too uncertain.

The President knows as well as I do that when he has called for action on things for which there exists bipartisan support, Republicans have been his strongest allies. Last year in the State of the Union, he called for free-trade agreements. We worked hard to get them done and we did. Since then he called for an extension of the highway and FAA bills and the jobs that come with them. We did both with strong bipartisan support. The President asked

for patent reform. We got that done too.

The President knows as well as we do we are happy to work with him whenever he is willing to work with us. If he turns his back on that good-faith offer, as we expect he will this year, we will remind people the problems we face are not about what Congress may or may not do in the future but what this President has already done—what has already happened.

Let the President turn his back on bipartisanship, let the press cover every futile speech and every staged event, but we intend to do our jobs. We invite him to join us.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 4 p.m. today, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees, with the first 30 minutes controlled by the majority leader or his designee and the second 30 minutes controlled by the Republican leader or his designee.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois.

BIPARTISAN COOPERATION

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I listened to the speech just given by the Republican leader of the Senate. He expresses a sentiment Americans share; that it is time for us to work together in the Senate and the House, across the board in Washington, and solve the problems which American families face every single day.

I agree with him completely. Unfortunately, the record does not reflect the level of cooperation which the American people are expecting. It was hardly a month or two into the Obama administration when the Republican leader announced that his highest priority was to make certain Barack Obama was a one-term President.

It is difficult to establish a working relationship when the first words out of a Republican leader's mouth are: We are going to defeat you. Then, as we addressed the largest issues of the day, time and again, we found little or no bipartisan cooperation. I think back to the important, historic debate on health care. If there was ever a moment when we should have come together with a bipartisan solution, it was that moment.

Despite the best efforts of Senator BAUCUS, the Democratic Finance chair and others, we were unable to even get

a core group of Republicans to join us in this conversation about containing the overwhelming increase in the cost of health care. At the end of the day, after one of the most painfully long and rancorous debates in Senate history, not one single Republican Senator would vote for health care reform—not one.

The same thing held true when it came to Wall Street reform. Many of us felt the recession we are currently coming out of was created by mismanagement and greed at the highest levels of our financial institutions. Many of us were angered by the fact that we were called on, with a political gun to our heads, and told, if we do not pass a bailout program for the biggest banks in America, our economy will crater and the weakest, poorest people in America will suffer the most.

That was our choice, our Faustian choice given at that moment. Many of us were determined to never let that happen again. So we put together a Wall Street reform bill. Senator Chris Dodd of Connecticut, now retired, led the effort on the Democratic side, and we tried to come up with a bipartisan bill. We worked to do it. He was masterful in his day and did everything in his power to make it a bipartisan bill. Yet at the end of the day, not one single Republican would vote for Wall Street reform—not one.

Now, on the campaign trail, we hear from Republican candidates that they are going to repeal Wall Street reform. They are going to repeal health care reform. They are not creating an environment that is conducive to the level of cooperation of which Senator MCCONNELL earlier spoke.

I hope he is right; that even in this Presidential election year, we can find some common ground. There are several items which are immediately before us which require it: First, the extension of the payroll tax cut. This is a cut that helps working families across America and helps the economy. It will expire at the end of February if we do not reach a bipartisan agreement to extend it, along with unemployment benefits.

Secondly, postal reform. Many of the suggestions that have been made by the Postmaster General about saving money at the post office create real hardship in States such as Illinois, where some nine different mail processing facilities would be closed, closed in areas where I, frankly, could never justify it because they do a volume of work, do it well, and perform a valuable function. We have a chance. By May 15, the deadline which the Postmaster General agreed to in my office—by May 15, if we enact legislation signed by the President to save money and keep the post office running in the right direction, then we can avoid some of these onerous cuts and choices we have heard about.

But the burden falls on Congress, Democrats and Republicans, to achieve it. I hope we can.

CUBA AND HAITI

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, last week, I had the opportunity to visit two island nations near our shores, Cuba and Haiti. Each is facing enormous problems—in Cuba, how to reform a Communist dictatorship of over half a century into a modern democratic member of the community of nations, and in Haiti how to rebuild from a devastating earthquake of 2 years ago in a nation already one of the poorest on Earth.

I concluded the trip more optimistic about Haiti, despite all its challenges, than Cuba, which quite simply appeared frozen in time in an ideology which should be cast aside for a more modern view of how to progress in the 21st century.

Let me start with Cuba. I am no fan of the Castro regime, but I am also no fan of the foreign policy of the United States. When I look back at what we tried to achieve for over 50 years in Cuba, any honest, objective analysis will have to tell you we did not achieve our goal. Fidel Castro is not a casualty of our own foreign policy; he is a casualty of old age. He is still there, and his brother now reins as his successor in Cuba.

Despite some notable achievement in this nation of Cuba, in areas such as health and education—and I saw firsthand as I traveled around some of these achievements—the government has maintained a grip on this island which is unfair to many of the people who live there.

Political opposition is swiftly and harshly repressed, often with severe prison sentences and deeply troubling harassment. Those pursuing greater political freedom of government accountability at times even find their young children threatened, as was sadly noted in the New York Times on Sunday.

In this most recent incident, Maritza Pelegrino Cabrales found herself repeatedly harassed by government officials for associating with the Ladies in White, a group of wives, mothers, and daughters, of political prisoners. Incredibly, state security officers threatened to take away her 5- and 7-year-old daughters.

Other brave Cubans, such as Oswaldo Paya, who collected thousands of signatures on a petition calling for modest political change, found himself and his colleagues harassed and in some cases jailed. Tragically, the petition process for change was actually called for in the Cuban Constitution. He was only following the Constitution of his country, and he ended up being harassed and many who supported him arrested.

Nonetheless, under President Raul Castro, there has been some modest reform, the conditional release of some political prisoners, and some economic reform. There has also been some serious oil exploration underway off the coast of Cuba. I wanted to go to Cuba for the first time to visit that part of