

and in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

I will yield for the Senator's question.

Mr. TOOMEY. Madam President, it is hard for me to follow this. The Senator is decrying the effects of the sequestration, and what Senator INHOFE and I are offering is a way to minimize the damage.

In the President's submitted request for the FAA, did he contemplate laying off air traffic controllers or closing towers? I know the answer. The President's budget—which he submitted to Congress and is a public document—requested a certain funding for the FAA.

Mr. DURBIN. For the next fiscal year?

Mr. TOOMEY. For the current fiscal year, the President's most recent request. The President's request was for less money than the FAA will have if the sequester goes through. I don't think the President was planning to lay off air traffic controllers.

Mr. DURBIN. Reclaiming my time, this is getting perilously close to a debate, which I will tell those in attendance never happens on the floor of the Senate. I will tell the Senator at this time we are dealing with the CR and last year's appropriations for the Department of Transportation; that is what Secretary LaHood is using. He is using the Budget Control Act numbers. So the President's request, notwithstanding—I am not sure how the Senator voted, but there was a bipartisan vote for limiting the amount of money that could be spent in this fiscal year. I voted for it, and that is what the Secretary is operating under.

The reality is this: Even with the Inhofe amendment, \$1 billion has to be cut from the Department of Transportation, and the flexibility notwithstanding, the options are so limited at this point in time.

I will tell the Senator pointblank that I believe we need to reduce this deficit. Sequestration is a terrible way, but there is an alternative. There will be an alternative this afternoon, and we will ask the Senator from Pennsylvania and to the Senator from Oklahoma: Are they prepared to say we are going to limit the direct agriculture support payments to farmers who have had the most profitable years in their lives and don't need them? Are they prepared to say that people making \$5 million a year in income ought to pay the same tax rate as the secretaries who work for them? If they are, we can avoid the worst parts of the sequestration. If they are not, be prepared, we are in for a pretty rough ride.

Mr. INHOFE. Would the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HARKIN. This has been very interesting. This is not what I was going to speak on. I was going to speak on the amount of cuts we have already taken in our appropriations bill on Labor, Health, Human Services, Edu-

cation, NIH, and Centers for Disease Control.

I could not help but hear my friend from Pennsylvania talk about the President's budget as though that is controlling this. Would the Republicans want to adopt everything in the President's budget? I don't think so. They might want to select this or that or this or that, but are we now hearing from my friends on the other side that we should just *carte blanche* rubberstamp the President's budget? I sure hope not.

I remind my friends that the Constitution of the United States clearly says this body has two functions: taxing and spending—not the President and not the executive branch. The executive branch can propose whatever budget they want, it is up to us to decide both how to collect the taxpayers' money and how to spend it. It does not matter to me exactly what the President proposes. What I want to know is how do we—as Senators and as Congressmen—feel about where we should be investing our money and on what we ought to be spending the taxpayers' money.

The idea that somehow the President's budget says this or that and that people can pick and choose whatever they want with it, I submit again, I will bet my friends on the other side will not say: We will just adopt the President's budget as it is and we will go with that. I don't think they are ready to do that. I would not even do that for a President of my own party.

I wish to talk a second, again, about sort of the intransigence on the part of my friends on the Republican side—not only in this body but in the other body—of not countenancing any other funding or raising of revenues. I keep hearing the Speaker say: We gave revenues last month, that we had \$700 billion of revenues last month; now it is time to talk about spending cuts.

What the Speaker has done is he has drawn an arbitrary starting line of January 2013. What about last year and the year before when we adopted over \$1.4 trillion in spending cuts that have already been adopted? What about the starting line there? That is when we started to address the \$4 trillion we needed by 2020 to stabilize our debt.

We have come up with about \$1.4 trillion in spending cuts and about \$700 billion in revenue. It is not the idea that we have already given up and that we have collected enough revenue. That is not it at all. Going forward we need a balance between revenues and spending cuts.

I want to read some of the things we have done in our own committee last year. We had \$1.3 billion in cuts. We eliminated the education technology state grants, which a lot of people kind of liked. The Even Start Program was eliminated. The tech-prep education state grants were eliminated. The mentoring children of prisoners was eliminated; the foreign language assistance was eliminated; the civic education

was eliminated; The Alcohol Abuse Reduction Program was eliminated. The career pathways innovation fund was eliminated.

Many of these programs were started by my friends on the Republican side at some time in the past, some were started by Democrats, but most of them were started jointly with Republican and Democrats. What I am pointing out is that we have already cut a lot of things out of Health and Human Services, education, NIH, and the Centers for Disease Control. I can tell that you Dr. Francis Collins, the head of NIH, warned that the sequester will slash another \$1.6 billion from NIH's budget at the very time when we are on the cusp of having some good breakthroughs in medical research. A lot of medical researchers have been lined up and doing some great programs out there. Now all of a sudden they are going to have the rug pulled out from underneath them, but that is what is going to happen.

I might mention the kids with disabilities and what is going to happen with the funding for the IDEA, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. I am told about 7,200 teachers, aides, and other staff who help our communities and our schools cope with kids with disabilities who come into schools—because under IDEA we are providing that kind of support—are going to be cut. But it is going to be cut.

So this idea that somehow we can keep cutting and cutting and cutting and we are going to get to some magic land where we can continue to function as a society just isn't so. We need revenues. That is what is in the bill the majority leader has proposed, revenues that will help us reach that point where we can have both spending cuts and revenues and stabilize our debt at a reasonable percentage of our GDP.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to waive the mandatory quorum call in relation to the cloture vote on the motion to proceed to S. 16.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

TO PROVIDE FOR A SEQUESTER REPLACEMENT—MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 16, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 19, a bill to provide for a sequester replacement.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 19, S. 16, an Inhofe/Toomey bill to cancel budgetary resources for fiscal year 2013.

Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, Patrick J. Toomey, James M. Inhofe, Johnny Isakson, Richard Burr, John Thune, Tom Coburn, Jeff Sessions, Roger F. Wicker, Mike Johanns, Mike Crapo, Pat Roberts, Ron Johnson, James E. Risch, Jerry Moran, John Barrasso.

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 proceed on S. 16, a bill to provide for a sequester replacement, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 38, nays 62, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 26 Leg.]

YEAS—38

Alexander	Enzi	Murkowski
Barrasso	Fischer	Portman
Baucus	Flake	Risch
Blunt	Grassley	Roberts
Boozman	Hatch	Scott
Burr	Hoeben	Sessions
Chambliss	Inhofe	Shelby
Coats	Isakson	Thune
Coburn	Johanns	Toomey
Cochran	Johnson (WI)	Vitter
Corker	Kirk	Warner
Cornyn	McConnell	Wicker
Crapo	Moran	

NAYS—62

Ayotte	Hagan	Murphy
Baldwin	Harkin	Murray
Begich	Heinrich	Nelson
Bennet	Heitkamp	Paul
Blumenthal	Heller	Pryor
Boxer	Hirono	Reed
Brown	Johnson (SD)	Reid
Cantwell	Kaine	Rockefeller
Cardin	King	Rubio
Carper	Klobuchar	Sanders
Casey	Landrieu	Schatz
Collins	Lautenberg	Schumer
Coons	Leahy	Shaheen
Cowan	Lee	Stabenow
Cruz	Levin	Tester
Donnelly	Manchin	Udall (CO)
Durbin	McCain	Udall (NM)
Feinstein	McCaskey	Warren
Franken	Menendez	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Merkley	Wyden
Graham	Mikulski	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 38, the nays are 62. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

Under the previous order, the motion to proceed to S. 16 is withdrawn.

AMERICAN FAMILY ECONOMIC PROTECTION ACT OF 2013—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 18, S. 388, a bill to appropriately limit sequestration, to eliminate tax loopholes, and for other purposes.

Harry Reid, Barbara A. Mikulski, Patty Murray, Sheldon Whitehouse, Mark Begich, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Jack Reed, Sherrod Brown, Patrick J. Leahy, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Richard J. Durbin, Jeanne Shaheen, Richard Blumenthal, Benjamin L. Cardin, Charles E. Schumer, Barbara Boxer, 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 proceed to S. 388, a bill to appropriately limit sequestration, to eliminate tax loopholes, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 51, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 27 Leg.]

YEAS—51

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

NAYS—49

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. WARREN). On this vote the yeas are 51, the nays are 49. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is entered.

The majority leader.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that we now proceed to a period of morning business with Senators allowed to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

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

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

CORPORATE JET LOOPHOLE

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, as we all know, our country faces tremendous fiscal challenges. We expect our President, our leaders, and those of us in Congress to engage in a meaningful and honest discussion about debt, deficits, and the direction of our Nation. Unfortunately, I think what Americans—certainly Kansans—are hearing from the White House and from some prominent Democrats is a relentless focus on political gimmicks to solve our problems.

An example of one of those is the so-called corporate jet loophole. We are focused on that instead of a serious plan to address the looming sequestration cuts that threaten to harm our economy. The President's fixation on corporate jets stands in direct contrast with his supposed desire to help the aviation industry and create jobs. Ending the accelerated depreciation schedule for general aviation aircraft will send hundreds if not thousands of hard-working Kansans straight to the unemployment line. My State is blessed with a significant number of people who work in the aviation industry.

This rhetoric is dangerous. It is certainly hypocritical. The 5-year depreciation schedule has been law for nearly a quarter of a century, and it was not created for the benefit of the "rich" or "wealthy" but was created for the benefit of the 1.2 million Americans who make a living building and servicing these airplanes. Accelerated depreciation helps spur manufacturing and creates jobs.

I am disappointed that the President continues his endless campaign to score political points rather than to work toward a real solution to solve our Nation's fiscal challenges. When 23 million Americans are looking for work, our government's first priority should be to create an environment where business can grow and hire additional workers. Increasing taxes on corporate jets and other general aviation aircraft sales will only further stifle economic recovery and result in additional job losses.

According to our Joint Committee on Taxation, closing the "loophole,"