

Second—and this is a strategic issue—this is a bigger plane that is being purchased by the military. It is going to need a longer landing strip. Are those longer landing strips going to be available in countries such as Azerbaijan or Kazakhstan or are we going to be able to get a longer runway to be able to land on? Now we have a plane that will carry more fuel, but it will take a longer landing strip. We can build those in the United States. We can build bigger hangars here. Can we around the world so we can have the reach we need?

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield for a question?

Mr. BROWNBACK. I am happy to yield.

Mrs. MURRAY. I am listening to the Senator from Kansas, and he makes a very good point about the infrastructure that will be needed to be built to build these larger airplanes. Was any of the cost of building those runways or those hangars to accommodate the larger airplanes in part of the bid from Airbus?

Mr. BROWNBACK. I understand from the Air Force yesterday that some of it was, but I don't understand if it was—I do not know fully if it was just the U.S. cost or if it is also what we are going to have to get from other countries around the world on costs there for landing, longer landing strips, and bigger hangars to be able to put any of the aircraft in. So I don't know if that is fully in it as well. But these are huge, decade-long projects and costs.

Mrs. MURRAY. I thank the Senator. I think it is a point we have to look at in terms of the costs of providing this military contract to a subsidized foreign company as well as the future costs—not just for those airplanes but for the infrastructure to handle it and our capability of doing that.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, we have just started this discussion, and I think it is a big one, I think it is an important one, whether we should be dependent upon European governments for our global reach in military for our aircraft. That is what tankers provide us is a global reach and whether we should be dependent on the European governments—upon the French, upon the Germans, upon the Brits—for our global reach. I don't think we should be. I think we have to look at the subsidization of this cost by the Europeans. I think that needs to be discounted and taken out of this proposal. I think we have to look at a long-term project, and we are going to be talking about this a lot before we go forward with this—as Chancellor Merkel called it, this giant success for Airbus and the European aviation industry. It may have been that it is at our cost. I am not going to stand still and let it happen.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, what is the regular business? Are we in morning business? Do we have a half hour?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. We are in morning business and the Senator has a half hour.

THE BUDGET

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I am going to speak, and then I understand the Senator from Texas is going to speak a little bit about the coming events of the next 2 weeks which will be the issue of how we address the budget of the United States. This is an annual event, of course, and so what I am going to give is a little review of last year's budget and where we are going with this year's budget. I regret to say it is a review of what amounts to basically a horror movie because the budget which was produced last year by the Democratic Congress was a horrible thing for the American people in the way of increasing taxes and increasing spending and increasing debt on the American people.

Now, we will hear from the other side of the aisle: Well, the President's budget does this and the President's budget does that and the President's budget does this. However, I think the people who are listening to this discussion should understand the President has no legal responsibility in the area of the budget and producing the budget; that under the Budget Act, the President can send up a budget and that is where it stops. The actual budget is produced by the Congress of the United States, the House and the Senate. It is not—and this is important—it is not signed by the President of the United States. He cannot veto it. The budget of the United States is purely a child of and a product of the House and the Senate and the U.S. Government. So it is our responsibility—not the President's responsibility—to produce a budget that is responsible for the American people and especially for working Americans, so they are not overburdened by the Government, and for our children and our grandchildren, so we don't put too much debt on them as a government.

Last year was the first time the Democratic Congress produced a budget in 12 years. They had the benefit of the doubt. When they said they were going to control spending, people gave them the benefit of the doubt. When they said they were going to address the problems which we confront with entitlements because of the baby boom generation and the cost that is going to be put on our children, people gave them the benefit of the doubt. When they said they were going to use pay-go rules—this motherhood term—to discipline spending around here, people gave them the benefit of the doubt. When they said they weren't going to raise the national debt any more than the President was, people gave them the benefit of the doubt. When they said they weren't going to raise taxes on the American people, that they were

going to find revenues by simply collecting taxes that were already owed, people gave them the benefit of the doubt.

Well, the shell game is over. The benefit of the doubt no longer applies. The record is in and the record is pretty dismal.

The budget from last year produced by the Democratic Congress increased taxes over a 5-year period by \$736 billion. It dramatically increased spending. In the discretionary accounts, the Democratic budget last year, as it was finally executed, increased spending over what the President requested. The President requested a \$60 billion increase in discretionary spending. It increased spending or proposed to increase spending when you combine the supplemental proposals and the actual budgeting proposals by over \$40 billion. It added \$2.5 trillion—trillion—to the Federal debt over the 5-year period. This term “pay-go” is the most abused term on the floor of the Senate and on the floor of the House in the area of fiscal discipline: “Oh, we are going to use pay-go to discipline Federal spending.” We hear that from every Democratic candidate starting with their Presidential candidates right down to their House Members.

Last year on 15 different occasions they either directly waived pay-go or they gamed it in the most cynical manner by changing dates, changing years, moving money here, moving money there, to the tune of \$143 billion of new spending, which should have been subject to pay-go, which was not. It was simply added to the deficit and to the debt of our children, that our children will have to pay. They didn't do one thing about addressing the most significant fiscal issue we face as a country, which is the pending meltdown of our Nation's fiscal policy because of the \$66 trillion of unfunded liability we have on the books as a result of obligations and commitments we have made to the baby boom generation which is beginning to retire right now—\$66 trillion. The President at least sent up a package which proposed trying to discipline the rate of growth of entitlement spending—specifically Medicare—in very reasonable ways, by asking people such as Warren Buffett, for example, to pay a fair cost of their drug benefit—people over 65 who have a lot of money should pay some cost of their drug benefit; by using technology more aggressively, by limiting the number of lawsuits that are brought against doctors to something reasonable along what is known as the California or Texas models. The President's proposals would have limited this liability here as it related to health care by \$8 trillion. It would have reduced it. They were reasonable proposals.

But the Democratic budget, as passed and as executed, not only didn't limit or reduce in any way this outyear liability, they actually aggravated it. They aggravated it dramatically, by \$466 billion over a 5-year period. It was totally irresponsible.

On the tax side, this tax increase is real dollars—real dollars that Americans are going to have to pay. For 43 million Americans, under the Democratic budget as was passed last year, their taxes will go up by \$2,300 a year—\$2,300 a year beginning in 2011. For 18 million seniors, their taxes will go up by \$2,200 a year—that is a lot of money for somebody—beginning in 2011. For low-income Americans, 7.8 million Americans who do not pay taxes today because the 10-percent bracket is in place, their taxes will go up. They will have to start paying taxes. For small businesspeople, 27 million small businesses that file what is known as a subchapter S, which means they basically are taxed as individuals, their taxes will go up on average \$4,100. Those are real dollars people are going to have to pay in new taxes as a result of the Democratic budget.

Let's put it in another context. The Democratic budget, the nightmare budget, the shell budget, added \$2.5 trillion to the debt: \$736 billion in new taxes, \$466 billion in new deficit spending in the area of mandatory increases, \$205 billion over 5 years in discretionary increases over what the President suggested—huge increases, totally irresponsible.

Equally important, as I mentioned, here is the tax increase, discretionary increase, the debt increase under the Democratic budget and absolutely no mandatory savings, which is the biggest issue of concern for us as a nation as we look into the outyears from the standpoint of being able to pass on to our children affordable Government. If you give to your children the debts of today, this \$2.5 trillion they added, and you put on top of that \$66 trillion of debt as a result of Medicare and Medicaid and Social Security costs that we haven't figured out how we are going to pay for, you are essentially going to say to our children: I am sorry, you can't have as good a life as we have had as a generation. You are not going to be able to send your kids to college. You are not going to be able to buy your first house. You are not going to be able to live the quality of life Americans have been experiencing throughout the generation of the baby boom generation because we are going to put on you so much debt, so many costs, we are simply going to overwhelm you.

What did the Democratic budget do to address that? Nothing. A lot of lip service. In one of the most obscene—obscene is the only accurate term—actions of budgetary gimmickry, the Democratic budget claimed they were going to raise \$300 billion in tax revenues from people who owe taxes but weren't paying them. This is how they are going to pay for all their new programs. They are going to raise \$300 billion collected from people who owe taxes. Well, yes, those are the estimates. There is a huge amount of money out there that isn't being collected today and should be collected. But how much was collected under the

Democratic budget of that owed and unpaid balance? Zero. Why was that? Why did they only get zero? Because they actually cut the dollars going to the Internal Revenue Service for enforcement. So not only could the Internal Revenue Service not collect the additional money—and they could never have gotten \$30 billion anyway—the highest estimate the Internal Revenue Service gave us was something in the range of 20 billion to 30 billion was their best number. They plugged this number in that the Democrats said they were going to get, which is \$300 billion, and why did they plug it in? Because they wanted to spend it. They wanted to spend \$300 billion.

It is pretty interesting because, if you go back here, you will notice discretionary spending went up \$205 billion, right here, and they claimed they were going to pay for that and have a little surplus with this empty number which they never got of \$300 billion. Where did the \$205 billion actually get paid for? How did it get paid for? It got paid for by putting debt—debt—on our children's shoulders.

Then, on top of that, of course, they are going to raise taxes by \$336 billion, as I mentioned. For 34 million Americans, it means a \$2,300 tax increase.

As if this isn't bad enough, their track record now is such a glaring example of fraud and misdeeds and misrepresentation of a shell game, of claiming one thing and doing the opposite in the area of tax policy and raising taxes when they said they would not, raising spending when they said they would not, not addressing entitlements when they said they would. As if that isn't bad enough, we now have the Presidential candidates out there campaigning. On top of the track record of total gross fiscal mismanagement, we have Presidential candidates on their side of the aisle making proposals to increase spending which dwarf what is already here, a dramatic rise in spending.

Senator OBAMA, for example, has proposed 158 new programs that we know of, that we can score—158—totaling annual increases in spending—annual—of \$300 billion a year plus. Senator OBAMA and Senator CLINTON say: Well, we are going to pay for this by taxing the rich; we will just tax the rich, tax the rich, tax the rich, tax the rich.

Let's look at the numbers. If we take the top rates in America, which are the rates the rich pay, back to the days of Bill Clinton, you take them from 35 percent—they pay 35 percent of their income to taxes now—take it back up to approximately 40 percent, 39.6 percent which is, I presume, what they are referring to—and, in fact, that is what they are specifically referring to—they say they are going back to the Clinton tax rates for the rich. You raise \$25 billion in income taxes.

Senator OBAMA has already proposed spending \$300 billion plus a year. So he is short \$280 billion. From where is that going to come? That is going to

come from raising taxes on all the other Americans who work and pay income taxes. He is talking about basically repealing all the Bush initiatives and, believe me, even if he does that, he cannot raise enough money to pay for what he is proposing. So he is talking about adding dramatically to the debt. It is a spend-arama, an Obama spend-arama, which is going to cause us huge problems with taxes.

So as we go into this next budget, there is no longer the benefit of the doubt out there for our colleagues on the other side of the aisle. They now have a track record of a budget that raised taxes \$736 billion, a track record of a budget that increased discretionary spending by \$205 billion, a track record of a budget that increased the debt by \$2.5 trillion, a track record where they game their own pay-go rules—game them—so they spend \$143 billion, which they should have had to offset, without any offsets, and a track record of not addressing the most significant issue we have today, which is how do we pay for the future costs of the retirement of the baby boom generation and not put that burden on our children.

I suspect the budget they are going to bring forward next week is going to look a lot like the one they passed last year. But when they claim this year they are going to get another \$300 billion from some wizard behind the screen by collecting taxes that are owed but are not collected, I hope the press and the American people will say: But hold it. You already claimed that once. Are you going to do it again?

When they claim they are going to discipline spending around here by using pay-go, I hope people will say: Hold it. Last year you said you were going to do that, and you spent \$143 billion subject to pay-go.

When they claim they are not going to raise taxes, somebody has to say: Hold it. The only way you can pay for your program is to repeal the tax laws as they presently exist and make the taxes go up dramatically on all Americans, not just on wealthy Americans.

And when they claim they are not going to increase discretionary spending, somebody needs to ask: Hold it. Last year you increased discretionary spending by \$205 billion over what the President wanted in nondefense discretionary.

They have no credibility any longer. So I hope the American people and the press, and certainly I hope the Senate, will ask some serious questions of them as they bring forward their budget.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from New Hampshire for his leadership as the ranking member of the Senate Budget Committee and somebody whom I think understands the complexities of the Federal budget better than just about anybody. I do not claim to have that same

level of understanding, but what I do think I understand is what works and what does not work.

I will cite as an example a story in today's Wall Street Journal comparing my State, Texas, to another State that I will not name for present purposes, and wondering why the economy is booming, why jobs are being created in Texas when jobs are leaving the other unnamed State. They cited three main reasons. One is the belief in the benefits of free trade and selling our goods and services overseas in a reciprocal free-trade arrangement. They cite lower taxes which provide more incentive for productivity. And they cite the fact that in Texas, you have a right to work without having to belong to a labor union. You can if you want to, but you don't have to in order to work. And I add to those three items, sensible tort reform, which has not only created a business environment in our State which says to employers: You are not prey for predatory activity on the part of the trial bar, but you are welcome in our State to create jobs. Yes, you are going to be held accountable, but we are not going to create a hostile litigation lottery which is going to chase jobs and employers out of our State.

A lot of those basic principles which have helped make my State, the State of Texas, such a welcoming State for economic growth and prosperity and creating jobs and opportunity apply to the Federal budget, too, about which I wish to talk.

Senator GREGG had this chart up which talks about last year's budget; frankly, things that were done last year that I hope we would have learned our lesson this year and will not repeat. For example, last year's budget anticipated a tax increase on the American people of \$736 billion. One might ask: From where is that money going to come? Is Congress actually going to vote for a tax increase? We may recall that the tax relief that we passed in 2001 and 2003 was not permanent because we could not get sufficient votes to make it permanent, so it was temporary. A significant portion of that tax relief—the capital gains and the dividends reduction—will expire during this budget period. It will result, if it does expire, without Congress acting, in effectively the largest tax increase in American history—but here is the worst part—without a vote of Congress. In other words, by Congress's inaction, we will see the largest tax increase in American history, and that is part of the revenue that this budget that was passed last year anticipates.

That contradicts the lesson I mentioned a moment ago that we have experienced in my State. We don't have a State income tax. We have tried to keep taxes as low as possible. It just makes common sense. You don't have to have a Ph.D. in economics to understand that if you want more of something, then you reduce the burden of producing it through lower taxes, through less regulation, and less litiga-

tion. If you want less of something, then you increase taxes, you increase regulation, you increase litigation. To me, that is the lesson we have learned, not only in my State, as I mentioned, but also in the Congress as a result of the tax relief we did pass in 2001 and 2003. We have seen more than 50 straight months of economic growth with more than 9 million new jobs created in the United States since 2003. Was that an accident? Was it serendipity? No, it was a result of reducing the burden of producing income and allowing taxpayers to keep more of what they earn, and it resulted, coincidentally, in some of the highest levels of revenue to the Federal Treasury because more people were working. They were incentivized to work harder and, as a consequence, they ended up paying more taxes which generated more revenue to the Federal Treasury, bringing the deficit down over what had originally been projected.

Of course, keeping taxes low is part of the equation. The other part of the equation is spending. As Senator GREGG pointed out, this budget passed last year dramatically increased Federal spending. This is one of the hardest things Members of the Congress have to do because, of course, we have people coming to see us every day saying: Senator, I would like your help funding this transportation project or providing an appropriation to pay for this or for that. But the fact is, we need to be good stewards of the taxpayers' money, and we need to learn how to say no because it is in the best interest of our economy and, in the long run, it is in the best interest of the American people because when we increase spending, we grow the size of the Federal Government. As Government expands, individual liberty contracts.

In other words, the bigger Government is, the less freedom we have to do what we want, as long as it is lawful. And what that means in the economic sphere is we are going to generate more economic activity, more revenue, create more jobs and more opportunity in the process.

So greater spending, dramatically increasing spending, is exactly the wrong thing. We ought to cut spending, eliminate wasteful programs, particularly those—and I have spoken on this issue before. The Office of Management and Budget has a Web site called expectmore.gov. You can go there and see a thousand different Federal programs that have been surveyed by the Office of Management and Budget, 22 percent of which either there is no evidence that they are meeting their intended purpose or effective, in other words, or the Office of Management and Budget simply cannot tell. Those are exactly the kinds of programs, the kind of waste that ought to be eliminated to reduce spending so that we can spend where it is absolutely necessary on our national priorities. But eliminate that wasteful spending. This budget does not do that.

Then, I think the most, frankly, shameful part of this budget is its failure to step up and recognize our responsibility to our children and our grandchildren who are depending on us to make sure they are not left with a debt they have to pay but, rather, they are left with, hopefully, a better life and better opportunity than we as their parents and our grandparents had. I know that is what my parents wanted for me and my brother and my sister. They wanted at least as good a life as they had, hopefully better. That is what every parent and every grandparent wants for their children and their grandchildren.

What has this Congress done to make sure that can happen? Frankly, not much. Let me put it this way: not enough because what we see is a growing debt. This budget passed last year grew the debt by \$2.5 trillion. I know it is hard to think in terms of trillions. I doubt there is a human mind that can really conceive of how big that is. I mentioned yesterday that a billion seconds ago it was 1976. We are talking about not billions but trillions—a huge amount of money.

This budget grew the debt by \$2.5 trillion but, frankly, what this proposed budget we are going to take up next week will in all likelihood fail to address is 66–6–6—\$66 trillion in unfunded liabilities of the Federal Government.

One might ask: We understand the budget deficit, but what is the debt? The deficit is the amount of money we overspend each year, but the debt is how much we owe to our children and grandchildren, the debt we are simply passing down to them by failing to fix the Medicare Program, failing to ensure that the Social Security Program is on a solid fiscal financial basis. The fact is, there is legislation that I hope will be offered during the course of this budget debate that a task force be created.

As a matter of fact, the distinguished Democratic chairman of the Budget Committee and Senator GREGG, as ranking member, have proposed a task force so we can finally roll up our sleeves and come to grips with this growing financial crisis and the debt we are simply passing on to our children and grandchildren.

I mentioned that \$1 trillion is impossible, perhaps, for us to comprehend, but let me bring it down to a number that we all can understand; and that is \$66 trillion in unfunded liabilities due to the Congress's failure to deal with this growing cost of entitlements—Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security. If you divide that by every man, woman, and child in the United States of America, it comes down to about \$175,000. So \$66 trillion in unfunded liabilities, for entitlements primarily, boils down to \$175,000 for every man, woman, and child, including the baby who was born last night. That baby was born into the United States—the most prosperous, the freest Nation in the

world—burdened by \$175,000 of debt because that baby's adult parents and the people they elect to Congress have failed to take responsibility to make sure that baby would be born into a world of prosperity, opportunity, and freedom. Instead, the baby has been born into a world that has that freedom and opportunity but also is burdened by \$175,000 in debt.

There are a lot of challenges that lie ahead, and I have other charts I won't bother the Members of the Senate with here today, but we have to have an important debate here as we write the Federal budget. I agree with the Senator from New Hampshire, this is not the President's budget. As a matter of fact, everybody knows what happens to a President's budget, whether it is a Democrat or Republican in the White House. It is basically "dead on arrival" at Congress. I could say it another way. The President proposes and Congress disposes the budget. But it is our responsibility to write that budget, and we should do so in a way that is fiscally responsible.

We should also do it in a way that addresses the real pinch that average Americans feel when they fill up their gas tank and find that gasoline is \$3.25, \$3.50 a gallon, on its way to \$4 a gallon probably this spring; and when they find that their health care costs continue to go up year after year after year such that they have less and less disposable income. Those are the sorts of things we ought to be paying attention to—reducing taxes, eliminating the debt, taking responsibility for that, and taking care of those bread-and-butter issues that the American people care about, because those are the ones that impact their quality of life on a day-to-day basis.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

CPSC REFORM ACT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of S. 2663, which the clerk will report by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2663) to reform the Consumer Product Safety Commission to provide greater protection for children's products, to improve the screening of noncompliant consumer products, to improve the effectiveness of consumer product recall programs, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arkansas.

AMENDMENT NO. 4090

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk, No. 4090, that I wish to call up.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. PRYOR] proposes an amendment numbered 4090.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To correct a typographical error.)

On page 87, line 11, strike "cigarette" and insert "Cigarette".

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, we are today, once again, starting the debate on the Consumer Product Safety reform bill. This is a very important piece of legislation, and I am sure Senators from all over the country have heard from their constituents about this because we saw last year a record number of product recalls, especially in the toy area. We saw last year recall after recall after recall, and some of the news stories that made the headlines were about lead in toys, but certainly the recalls last year were not in any way, shape, or form limited to lead.

Lead is a very serious problem. We deal with lead in this legislation. In fact, we virtually ban lead in all children's products. That is a very important new safety rule. If the Senate adopts this measure, the new safety rule would be that there is a very tough scientifically based lead standard for toys.

When I say "virtually ban," I do think it is important for my colleagues to understand that we can probably never absolutely get rid of lead in any product because there is some lead out in the atmosphere. It is a naturally occurring element. But we virtually ban lead in all children's products.

Another thing that we do, which I think is very important, is illustrated by this chart, and that is we recognize the changes in the U.S. economy. The last time the Senate reauthorized this legislation, which was in 1990 or 1992, we have to think about what the U.S. economy looked like. If you think about how many imports we had coming into this country from overseas, one of the things this chart illustrates is the number of imports in dollar figures, starting in 1974 and going up here to the year 2006. The actual numbers and the years aren't as important as the trend line. You can see what is happening with imports coming into this country.

We all know we are getting more and more imports, and one of the things I think we need to fight for is our U.S. manufacturing base, but that is not the discussion we are having here today. We are seeing more and more imports coming into this country. However, at the very same time, over the very same years, if you go to this bottom chart, again starting in 1974 and going up to this year, you will see what the Consumer Product Safety Commission's staff has done year by year.

Unfortunately, you see it peak in about 1980 or so, and then it starts to drop off dramatically. Here again, the numbers are not as important as the fact that you see this downward trend when it comes to employees at the Consumer Product Safety Commission. The reason that is important—and, by

the way, the numbers are 420 full-time employees, and at the height of the agency there were about 900. But those numbers are not as important as the trend. You can see that today we have less than half of the full-time employees at the CPSC as they did 20 years ago.

The problem is when you compare these two charts. Again, I totally understand we can work more efficiently today with things such as computers and telecommunications and all that. We can work more efficiently. We can do more with fewer people. I do acknowledge that. But when you look at how the imports have grown and how the Consumer Product Safety Commission staff has shrunk, that explains why you see a record number of recalls. That explains why you see millions and millions of products being pulled from the shelves last year. Because as the Consumer Product Safety Commission has become less capable, less able to deal with the changes in the import economy, what you are seeing is more and more dangerous products coming into this country.

I don't think it is an accident. My colleagues need to know that I don't think it is an accident that last year every single toy recall—and we will talk more about this in a few moments—but every single toy recall from last year was made in China. None of these were U.S. made. In fact, they weren't made in any other country except China. So we need to reexamine the priorities of this agency. We need to restructure the agency in such a way that it meets the needs of the changing U.S. economy. We need to help this agency right here, when it comes to dollar amounts and full-time employees for this agency.

Again, it may be another discussion where we try to help the U.S. economy here in the number of imports and try to manufacture more products here—that is another bill and that will come at some point in the future—but right now this is what we are focused on, is trying to make sure that the Consumer Product Safety Commission is equipped to handle the changes in the U.S. economy.

Mr. President, I see Senator KLOBUCHAR is here, and she wishes to say a few words. I will be on the floor all day today. I encourage my colleagues to come down and talk to me if they have amendments. Certainly we have seen a growing list of amendments. My hope would be that all the amendments would be germane and that we could maybe get a bipartisan agreement on amendments.

I know Senator STEVENS has been very good to deal with on this legislation. He and I have not talked about any of the amendments yet. I think our staffs have been talking with each other. But I encourage my colleagues to come to the floor when it is convenient, or send their staff over when it is convenient to talk about whatever