

[Congressional reaction](#) (Charlotte Observer – August 2, 2011)

[Sen. Richard Burr, R-N.C.](#)

"I'm going to support it primarily because it embraces most of the thresholds I said had to be met. One, it takes default off the table. Two, it ensures the House and Senate will get an up-or-down vote on a balanced budget amendment. Three, it sets a precedent for the future that's really going to require a dollar-for-dollar cut on the debt ceiling. And if we're able to maintain that, it would mean we're able to balance the federal budget in 10 years...."Is it a perfect piece of legislation? No. I would love to see us get into reform of entitlements, tax policy and the budget process. And it falls short of that."

Sen. Kay Hagan, D-N.C.

"This agreement averts a default crisis without relying on a short-term patch that would leave the markets in turmoil and harm our seniors, our veterans, or our military in the field. Though I would have preferred a bigger deal ...this agreement is a good start."

Sen. Lindsey Graham, R-S.C.

"Simply stated, it locks us into more debt, bigger government and most devastating of all, a weakened defense infrastructure at a time when we face growing threats. This agreement adds over \$7 trillion in new debt over the next decade and only makes small reductions in future spending."

Rep. Sue Myrick, R-N.C., who voted yes

"We have tried for a long time to get some of these things done with no success...You need to give (people) certainty and let them know their government won't fall apart It's a long-term process because if you try to do it too quickly a lot of people will be hurt." "

Rep. Larry Kissell, D-N.C., who voted no

"This deal is not a responsible way to do what we need to do, and I will not vote for it. I voted for a bipartisan compromise bill on Saturday that protected Social Security and Medicare, but I will not concede to having the budget balanced on the backs of our seniors."

Rep. **Mel Watt**, D-N.C., who voted no

"It obviously is not the best agreement ... but I also understand the importance of not defaulting on our obligations. It looks like short-term, it's better than where we probably are now. But after two years there are tremendous sacrifices that poor people and middle-class people would be hit hard by."

Rep. Patrick McHenry, R-N.C., who voted yes

"This plan achieves spending cuts that exceed the amount of the debt limit increase. It is a solid first step to control spending in Washington and put us on a path toward a balanced budget without job-killing tax increases."

Rep. Mick Mulvaney, R-S.C., who voted no

"This is sort of like the original (Speaker John) Boehner bill. It's a typical Washington solution. We won't cut that much this year. All the cuts come in the out years....To me it sounds like the same kinds of deals Washington has cut in the past that's led to \$14 trillion in debt. A 'Super Committee'? That's a deal only Washington would come up with."

