

Dole	Inhofe	Shelby
Ensign	Isakson	Smith
Enzi	Kyl	Specter
Graham	Lugar	Stevens
Grassley	Martinez	Sununu
Gregg	McConnell	Thune
Hagel	Murkowski	Vitter
Hatch	Roberts	Voinovich
Hutchison	Sessions	Wicker

PRESENT AND GIVING A LIVE PAIR, AS
PREVIOUSLY RECORDED—2

Domenici,
against

Warner, against

NOT VOTING—5

Biden	Clinton	McCain
Byrd	Kennedy	

The conference report was agreed to. Mr. CONRAD. I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I again thank all our colleagues. This is a significant vote because this is the first time in an election year since 2000 that we have been able to pass a budget. That sets a good example for the future.

I, again, especially thank Senator DOMENICI. This is his last vote on a budget. He, out of respect for this institution, respect for Senator BYRD, respect for the budget process, agreed to pair with Senator BYRD. We thank Senator DOMENICI for that gracious act.

And Senator WARNER, I deeply appreciate your willingness to pair with Senator KENNEDY, who, as we all know, is ill and recovering. You are a pro's pro, and we deeply appreciate the respect that you have shown for our colleague, Senator KENNEDY.

Again, I thank all of the staff who have worked so hard. I again want to conclude by thanking the ranking member, Senator GREGG, for all he did to allow us to complete work today.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, we are all familiar with the phrase "all you can eat." There are restaurants everywhere that specialize in feeding us until we burst. Needless to say, that isn't a good idea. Eating until you just can't eat any more isn't just a waste of resources, it is likely to have a severe impact on your future health—and your current waistline!

We are in a similar fix here in the Congress. Our country is in a sinkhole of debt and it's almost as if we have adopted a philosophy of "all you can spend" around here. Spending is out of control and we are doing more than just wasting resources—we are destroying the future of our children and our grandchildren. Our friends on the other side of the aisle don't seem to see what a terrible problem we face. Just like that all you can eat line, our colleagues are heading back to the buffet for one more full plate and leaving the bill for our children to pay. As the old adage says so well, you can pay me now, or pay me later—and our colleagues have chosen to leave the bills for later. We ought to know better.

This week the Senate is considering the conference report for the fiscal year 2009 budget resolution, a blueprint that is supposed to provide us with guidance for spending that reflects the priorities of the Congress. As stewards of the public trust, the Congress needs to make responsible choices that leave a fiscally sound country to our children and our grandchildren. Unfortunately, the budget resolution conference agreement we are debating this week doesn't confront any of the tough choices that face our country.

I will say once again that we cannot sustain the current level of spending without inflicting grave damage on the fiscal health of our country. This conference agreement rejects the President's proposals that slow the growth of spending in mandatory programs, as well as keep a handle on discretionary spending.

It does nothing to shore up the government's fiscal house, and instead leaves the tough choices to future Congresses and the next administration. Yet every day, Americans sit at their kitchen tables and tighten their own budgets to pay for gas, food and other necessary expenses—while we can't even impose meaningful discipline on spending here in Washington.

As stewards of the public trust, we owe it to all American taxpayers to use the funds they provide us in the most efficient way possible. If we do that, then we provide future generations with a strong economy.

As an accountant, I particularly welcome the opportunity to look at the overall spending priorities of our Nation. Fiscal year 2009 ought to be another tight year for spending. This year the Federal deficit is projected to be close to \$350 billion—under the Conference Agreement—which will pale in the face of major demands on resources as the so-called baby boom generation begins to reach eligibility for Social Security and Medicare. We must realistically deal with issues like increasing health care costs, tax policy, burgeoning energy costs, as well as continuing national security obligations. Americans deserve more than another "pass the buck" budget.

Mr. President, here is the truth about what the Democratic budget resolution would do. It will: raise taxes by \$1.2 trillion meaning that 43 million families with children will pay \$2,300 more each year, and 18 million seniors will pay \$2,200 more; increase spending by \$210 billion over 5 years. For fiscal year 2009, exceed the President's requested budget by \$24 billion; would allow the gross debt to climb by \$2 trillion by 2013; last year's budget grew our national debt by \$2.5 trillion. It ignores entitlement reform—there is no attempt to tackle the \$66 trillion in unsustainable long-term entitlement obligations that face our country. The President's budget proposed to reduce the rate of growth in one of our most expensive entitlements, Medicare. This would not cut Medicare at all—it would

simply reduce the rate of growth. This conference report rejects even slowing the growth in entitlements. For these reasons alone, the conference report ought to be rejected.

Congress ought to be considering a budget that reduces the national debt, promotes honest budgeting, and encourages true economic growth by reducing energy costs, reducing taxes, and reducing health care costs and increasing access for all Americans.

Last year, the majority also promised to abide by pay-go rules and actually pay for all new spending. Well, as far as I can see this has not happened, and in fact, pay-go enforcement rules have been weakened through a variety of different mechanisms and smoke and mirrors that taxpayers have ended up with billions in new spending.

Congress must take seriously the warnings from the General Accounting Office and the Congressional Budget Office about Federal expenditures spiraling out of control. We need to make procedural and process changes to directly address these problems. One of the many procedural reforms that I believe would promote fiscal responsibility is a 2-year budget process, known as biennial budgeting.

In fact, in his budget for fiscal year 2009, the President once again proposed commonsense budget reforms to restrain spending. He has several recommendations, including earmark reforms and the adoption of a 2-year budget for all executive branch agencies in order to give Congress more time for program reviews. Implementing these overall recommendations would be a step in the right direction.

The budget process takes up a considerable amount of time each year and is drenched in partisan politics, while other important issues end up on the back burner. The Federal budgeting and appropriations system is broken, and lends itself to spending indulgences taxpayers cannot afford. We only have to look to the mammoth spending bills that nobody has time to fully read or understand before they are passed into law. Last year's omnibus appropriations bill is an example of a system that promotes fiscal recklessness.

This conference report is a missed opportunity. There is a crucial need to enact procedural and process changes that will enable us to get this country on the right budgetary track again. We simply cannot risk the economic stability of future generations by continuing to "get by" with the status quo. The risks are far too great.

The conference report we are debating today is a hollow, tax and spend, big government budget. It makes no tough choices.

FISCAL YEAR 2009

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I would like to thank Chairman CONRAD and the other members of the Budget Committee for their kind words and

well wishes that have been directed toward me during our work on this the final budget resolution during my tenure in the Senate.

As most of you know, I have worked on many budgets and numerous other initiatives during my 36 year career. However, important work still remains for the Budget Committee. If I had more time I would without a doubt seek to address entitlement spending. I had pledged to work with Chairman CONRAD on his bipartisan bill and I am disappointed that we may not have time to take it up this year.

This budget, like many before it, fails to address the 800 pound gorilla in the room, otherwise known as entitlement spending. After 2010, spending related to the aging of the baby-boom generation will begin to raise the growth rate of total outlays. The annual growth rate of Social Security spending is expected to increase from about 4.5 percent this year to 6.5 percent by 2017. In addition, because the cost of health care is likely to continue rising rapidly, spending for Medicare and Medicaid is projected to grow even faster—in the range of 7 or 8 percent annually. Total outlays for Medicare and Medicaid are projected to more than double by 2017, increasing by 124 percent, while nominal GDP is projected to grow only 63 percent. The budget currently under consideration does not offer solutions, much less even address, entitlement spending or reform. I do not support this budget in its current form because it does not offer any meaningful solution for entitlement spending.

I offer this piece of advice to my colleagues serving on the Budget Committee: tackle entitlement spending. The Budget Committee should propel itself to the forefront of this debate and use the tools that only this committee has at its disposal to address the number one issue on the minds of the American public. With true leadership, this committee has the potential to turn mere Senators into heroes if they choose to address the entitlement programs. I urge Senators to come together and find a solution in the near future before it is too late to resolve this crisis.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I am pleased an agreement has been reached on a budget resolution conference report. It is the duty of Congress to approve the Nation's fiscal blueprint, and this year's budget report presents a responsible plan that rightfully prioritizes job creation and programs to support the safety, health, and education of America's children.

Our economy has long been suffering and is in need of a boost. This budget will help start to undo the damage caused by the administration's misguided fiscal policies and stave off additional cuts proposed by the administration that would affect important programs that are especially needed in this time of economic distress.

This budget rejects the President's failed policy of paying for tax cuts by

adding to the debt burden of our children and grandchildren. The fiscal year 2009 budget that President Bush sent to Congress in February would have us pursue the same failed priorities and policies that have proven so woefully wrong for Michigan and for our Nation. The President's proposal would dig us even deeper into the massive deficit ditch we are already facing. The President's proposal would provide even more tax cuts to the wealthiest among us, while at the same time it would cut funding for critical programs important to my State's economy and the well-being of the State of Michigan. This includes cuts to, among other things, health care funding, including Medicare and Medicaid; decreased funding for important investments in education; and the elimination of the Technology Innovation Program, formerly called the Advanced Technology Program, and the Manufacturing Extension Partnership, which helps small and mid-sized manufacturers compete in a global economy.

We need to break from those failed policies by forgoing irresponsible tax cuts for the wealthiest among us and making important investments in America's future; we must work to put our country back on track and begin the long process of climbing out of this deficit ditch.

That is why I am glad this resolution provides for a balanced budget by 2012. It also furthers our strong pay-go rules, which require that all mandatory spending and revenue provisions be deficit-neutral. It sets the course to fully offset a repair of the alternative minimum tax, which would otherwise cause nearly 20 million middle class taxpayers to be subject to a tax they were never intended to be subjected to. It also assumes middle income tax relief, including marriage penalty relief, the child tax credit, and the persistence of the 10 percent bracket.

I am pleased that this resolution includes my proposal to establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to promote American manufacturing. Congress needs to act to revitalize our domestic manufacturing sector. The administration has stood by passively while 3 million manufacturing jobs were lost to America.

This resolution also seeks to close the tax loopholes costing the Treasury large amounts of revenue and which have shifted an unfair burden to middle income taxpayers. Shutting down abusive tax shelters and offshore tax havens are two of the major tax gap initiatives assumed in the budget resolution. Additionally, this budget would reject many of the cuts in funding proposed by the President for essential health care and education programs. I believe this budget resolution, while only a blueprint for future action, sets us on a course of fiscal responsibility and paves the way for important investments in America's future.

I am also pleased that this conference report retains an amendment I

co-authored which, taken together with the underlying clean energy reserve fund, will support extension of the current production tax credits for renewable electricity and biodiesel fuel, the small-producer biodiesel tax credit, and clean renewable energy bond authority. It also proposes new tax credits for cellulosic ethanol and plug-in hybrid vehicles. I will continue to work to enact these necessary incentives.

Major bipartisan efforts will be needed to make true progress on the long-term fiscal problems we face. But this resolution represents a good start by proposing an end to the financing of unaffordable tax cuts for the wealthiest among us, as well as funding prudent investments to promote the health and well-being of our children.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of the fiscal year 2009 budget resolution conference report. As a member of the committee, I want to recognize Chairman CONRAD and thank him personally for his untiring efforts to craft a blueprint that will get our Nation's fiscal house back in order.

Perhaps more than at any time in our history, it is imperative that Congress focus seriously on our Nation's budget situation. The competing demands of an aging population, our current international commitments, growing competition in the global economy, our widening trade deficit, and shrinking revenues all require that we address our fiscal situation with urgency. Revenues are at a historic low point, while the demographics of the country are driving spending higher on needs that the private sector is ill-equipped to address. Now there is widespread consensus among working families that—regardless of the official definition—we are in a recession.

Employment growth during this administration has averaged fewer than 50,000 jobs a month—the lowest monthly rate for any administration since Dwight D. Eisenhower's and less than one-quarter the average of 237,000 jobs per month created during the Clinton administration.

Inflation-adjusted hourly wages have decreased by 1.3 percent since August 2003. Even median annual household income has decreased by \$1,700, or 3.6 percent, after accounting for inflation. These are aggregate statistics, but behind each of them are millions of families who are falling behind as a result of inadequate investment in the right priorities.

For too long, we have been moving in the wrong direction. Over the past 7 years, the Bush administration has sent us budgets with the wrong priorities. They have contained drastic cuts to education and health care programs. They did not provide for investment in our nation's public transit systems, bridges, and roads. They did not address energy efficiency. They ignored veterans' health care needs and actually attempted to make it more difficult for veterans to access the health

system we promised our troops. And they neglected the programs that help working families thrive, including child care, housing, community development, and job training. Recent Congresses supported those budgets, and exacerbated the fiscal crisis by enacting irresponsible tax cuts that America could not afford—tax cuts that overwhelmingly benefitted the wealthiest Americans, while providing very little help for working families. Last year, under new leadership in Congress, we passed a budget that began to change course. This budget continues that effort, and I am pleased to support it.

This conference agreement targets tax relief where it is most needed—at working families. This includes an extension of the child care tax credit, marriage penalty relief, and the 10 percent individual income tax bracket.

Equally important, this budget resolution is fiscally responsible. It will return us to a balanced budget, with a surplus of \$22 billion in 2012 and \$10 billion in 2013.

Even as crucial domestic programs have suffered under this administration, the Nation's debt has increased from \$5.8 trillion at the end of President Bush's first year in office to in excess of \$9 trillion.

If we fail to change course, we will leave our children and grandchildren an insurmountable legacy of debt. The fiscal policies of this current administration have erased the \$5.6 trillion surplus that was projected in 2000 and replaced it with a projected deficit of nearly \$4 trillion over the next 10 years.

The borrowing necessitated by deficit spending has jeopardized our economic position in the world, and it has clouded the outlook for generations of Americans to come. We have had to turn to foreign governments to borrow money. Our foreign-held debt has increased by more than 100 percent during this administration. In fact, in just one year, the total has increased from \$2.1 trillion to \$2.5 trillion. According to the Treasury Department, as of March 2008, the United States now owes more than \$600 billion to Japan, nearly \$500 billion to China, more than \$200 billion to the United Kingdom. We owe \$150 billion to oil exporting nations, up from \$112 billion last year. These levels of foreign-held debt threaten our independence as a nation, and they are unsustainable.

That is why it is so important that we make the difficult budget choices that can return us to a balanced budget, and that this resolution contain tools needed to get there, including pay-go.

This resolution calls for \$3.1 trillion in spending for the next fiscal year. It rejects the President's cuts to entitlement programs, and it funds domestic discretionary programs at \$21 billion above his budget request. This means that we can begin to make much needed improvements in the programs that help build our nation.

The many important areas that this budget addresses are particularly crucial in these difficult economic times for America's families. We provide for a reserve fund that will improve access to affordable housing for working families, we add \$40 million for emergency food assistance and we improve unemployment compensation.

In health care, I want to mention two specific areas. This budget makes room for critically needed increases in health research funding. The National Institutes of Health is headquartered in Maryland, and its grants fund research in my state and across the nation. Unfortunately, this is the sixth year in a row that NIH has been essentially flat-funded. I have the privilege of meeting often with biomedical researchers from my home state. They are working to find treatments and cures for our most challenging diseases—cancer, diabetes, arthritis, ALS, and others.

During the period when Congress doubled NIH funding—between 1998 and 2003—researchers' chances of securing NIH funding for a worthwhile grant proposal was one in four. Since 2003, their chances have dwindled to one in eleven. Undergraduate and graduate students alike are beginning to question their career choices and wonder if there is a future for them in biomedical research. With medical research inflation at nearly 3.5 percent, we must increase the agency's funding by at least that amount in order to break even. To make progress in the fight against disease, we must increase our spending substantially. I am pleased that our resolution rejects the President's planned cuts for this critical agency and makes room for additional funding.

This budget resolution also makes room for improvements to pediatric dental care. I have come to the floor of the Senate on several occasions to talk about a 12-year-old named Deamonte Driver. He lived just 6 miles from here in Prince George's County, MD. The Driver family, like many other families across the country, lacked dental coverage. At one point, his family had Medicaid, but they lost it when they moved into a shelter, and their paperwork fell through the cracks. When advocates for the family tried to help, it took more than 20 calls just to find a dentist who would treat him.

Deamonte began to complain of headaches in January 2007. An evaluation at Children's Hospital found that he had an abscessed tooth, but the condition was advanced and he needed emergency brain surgery. He later experienced seizures and a second operation. Even though he received additional treatment and appeared to be recovering, medical intervention had come too late. Deamonte passed away on Sunday, February 25, 2007. At the end, the total cost of his treatment exceeded a quarter of a million dollars—more than 3,000 times the \$80 it would have cost for a tooth extraction.

There is no excuse for us, in the wealthiest nation on Earth, to watch a

child die for lack of access to basic dental care. It is difficult to find dentists to treat low-income children for two reasons. First, because there is a shortage of pediatric dentists—only 4.3 percent of dental school graduates in 2001 reported pediatric dentistry as their specialty of choice; and second, because the reimbursement from public programs such as Medicaid and SCHIP is low.

Our budget rejects the President's cuts to dental training programs, and it is my hope that we will continue to work to increase the number of pediatric dentists and improve reimbursement for public programs. But there are thousands more children, like Deamonte's brothers who also need dental care—who cannot wait for us to recruit and train more dentists. I thank both Senator WHITEHOUSE, who joined me in offering an amendment in committee to address this issue, and the members of the Budget Committee who unanimously supported it. My amendment would establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund in the budget for legislation to improve access for low-income children who are in either Medicaid, SCHIP, or are uninsured. As a result, this budget will allow Congress to fund legislation to improve oral health care and more appropriately reimburse the providers who are willing to treat low-income children. These are the offices, clinics, and dental schools whose doors are open to underserved patients, but whose ability to treat large numbers is compromised by inadequate payments.

This budget also funds critical investments in homeland security. The President's budget reduced funding for important first responder programs, including the SAFER—Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response—grant program. The SAFER grant program directly funds fire departments and volunteer firefighter interest organizations to help them increase the number of trained, frontline firefighters. This budget rejects those cuts and will give firefighters needed resources to protect our communities.

I am proud that this resolution also addresses another issue that is critically important for Maryland. It calls for pay parity between civilian and military employees. With tens of thousands of Federal employees in Maryland, I have witnessed the additional burdens placed on our civil servants, particularly since the 2001 terrorist attacks on our Nation. These dedicated employees are called upon to assume greater risks with lower comparable pay to private sector wages. In addition, many Federal agencies now face a human capital crisis, with thousands of our most experienced employees eligible to retire in the next few years. Pay parity is necessary if we will be able to recruit and retain a quality Federal workforce, and this budget provides for it.

Finally, I also note that this budget supports our veterans. We rightly reject the President's misguided proposals to increase enrollment fees and copayments for veterans' health care services. We increase funding for the Department of Veterans Affairs so that we can improve VA health care facilities and improve access to rehabilitation, mental health services, traumatic brain injury services, and speed the processing time for disability claims.

Again, I thank Chairman CONRAD for his leadership in helping to bring forth this agreement. As he has said previously, it truly marks a new path forward for our country. I urged my colleagues to support it.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WHITEHOUSE). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent—

Mr. CONRAD. Will the Senator withhold for one moment?

Mr. COCHRAN. I am happy to withhold for my friend from North Dakota.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I have been asked to request that we go into a period of morning business until 12:45, with the time equally divided.

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

Mr. CONRAD. I thank the Chair, and I thank very much my colleague and my friend, Senator COCHRAN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

CLIMATE SECURITY ACT

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, my staff members and I hear from Mississippians every day about the crippling effects of high energy prices. We all understand the need for increasing clean energy supplies, and I hope we can continue to work to do that and to develop other innovative solutions to deal more effectively with this great problem. But the bill we are considering will not accomplish that goal. Instead, the legislation will have a detrimental effect on our economy. It will contribute to a higher overall cost of living, and it will be especially harmful to lower income families.

According to projections by the Energy Information Administration and the Environmental Protection Agency, energy costs are projected to rise because of this legislation. Energy prices are already at an all-time high. We cannot afford to increase these costs even further. By 2030, increased costs for delivered coal could range between

405 percent and 804 percent, natural gas prices could rise between 34 percent and 107 percent, and gasoline prices could go up between 17 percent and 41 percent. Although the substitute amendment we are considering imposes yearly cost ceilings, these high prices will still be realized unless improbable advancements in alternative energy production, such as 70 new nuclear reactors and 68 billion gallons of ethanol, are produced.

Various projections of this bill show not only will prices increase, Americans could lose jobs as industries struggle to keep costs down. I am proud of the new era of manufacturing that my State of Mississippi is entering, but I don't want Mississippians to lose the jobs we have fought so hard to obtain. The Environmental Protection Agency and the Energy Information Administration suggest that this bill could reduce the gross domestic product of the United States by as much as 7 percent by 2050 and could reduce the manufacturing output of the United States by almost 10 percent in 2030. A reduction in output means that industry will need fewer workers in order to keep their costs down. A need for fewer workers will result in job losses, and unemployment rates in my State are already too high.

I believe the Senate should spend time considering the best use of America's natural resources while being mindful of the environment. However, if we are going to mandate reductions in greenhouse gases, there are certain principles we need to keep in mind. The Senate must consider the costs we will impose on the consumers we represent. The legislation we have before us goes beyond what is required to reduce emissions and imposes harsh, costly restrictions on the industries and businesses we count on to keep our economy healthy.

The bill provides that only 30 percent of annual emissions reduction obligations can be met using credits and offsets. Only half of that amount can be from domestically generated credits, through a complex formula, and the remainder of the available credits would come from outside the United States. Many of these credits and offsets will likely come from the agricultural sector. Mississippi farmers are already engaged in better and more efficient practices, such as no-till farming, new irrigation efficiencies, and reforestation of marginal lands.

Another troubling aspect of the legislation is the creation of a massive new mandatory spending regime that would direct nearly \$3.3 trillion in auction revenues over the next several decades to dozens of specific programs, some that already exist but some that are new. These mandatory programs will not likely receive the proper oversight and control that the annual appropriations process provides. It is unreasonable to think we can know today whether it will be appropriate in 2050 to allocate 3.42 percent of auction reve-

nues for Department of the Interior adaptation activities or to allocate 3.1 percent of auction revenues in 2030 for cellulosic biomass programs.

As ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, where we have annual hearings and review the needs and the constraints we are dealing with under the budget for appropriating funds, I cannot support this approach that pretends to project what the appropriated amount should be years and years from now.

It is my hope we will be able to help restore a strong economy, create an energy infrastructure that provides for low-cost electrical and motor fuel prices, and foster a responsible attitude about our natural resources and the environment. However, the legislation we are now considering will not bring Americans lower energy costs or, realistically, a cleaner environment.

Unless major changes to this legislation are considered, I cannot support this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I could give these remarks now or I could have given them when we were on the bill because they address something that is disturbing a number of Senators. That concern is that the majority leader may be thinking of filling the tree, which means he is not going to allow us to offer a significant number of amendments to this bill. That is, from what I can tell, something that we should not do, and he should not do. As someone who knows him well and works with him well, I think it would be a mistake to fill the tree on a bill like this, and let me give a few examples from my own experience.

When we used to do business the way the Senate does business, not filling trees but filling many days with legislation of importance, we had a Clean Air Act, Mr. President. The manager of the bill was Ed Muskie. The Clean Air Act; Ed Muskie. The first bill of that sort that came to the floor. I was a brand new Senator. I was on the committee. Very interesting. I spent a great deal of time on the Senate floor just listening and watching. That bill was on the floor of the Senate 5 weeks—5 weeks not 5 days—with 168 amendments considered and 162 acted upon. Of those, 60 were Democratic.

Now, imagine this bill before us, which is far more important in terms of the ramifications to the American economy, to the costs that will be added to energy, to the trial run that we are taking upon ourselves to try to curtail carbon, which we don't even know will work, yet it will put into the marketplace trillions of new dollars that are allocations. There are certificates, not issued by the Treasury of the United States but, rather, issued under the mandate of this program. All of the language in this bill as to who gets those allocations, as though we walked around and walked the streets and tried to see who might need them and