



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 155

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 2009

No. 21

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable JEANNE SHAHEEN, a Senator from the State of New Hampshire.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Lord of all nations, light of the world, illuminate the hearts of our Senators today. Enable them to shine Your light into our Nation and world, not to glorify themselves but to honor You. Lord, give them the fire of ethical congruence that will enable them to reinforce lofty rhetoric with righteous actions. As they face daunting challenges, lift the light of Your countenance upon them. Keep them from growing weary in doing what is right, as You remind them of the certainty of a bountiful harvest. Lord, help them to see the great results that come from seeking to do Your will and from striving to let their words and thoughts please You.

We pray in Your holy Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable JEANNE SHAHEEN led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. BYRD).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, February 3, 2009.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby

appoint the Honorable JEANNE SHAHEEN, a Senator from the State of New Hampshire, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
President pro tempore.

Mrs. SHAHEEN thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Madam President, it doesn't appear that Senator McCANNELL or I will give any opening statements today. Therefore, we will move immediately to the Economic Recovery Act, H.R. 1.

The Senate will recess today from 12:30 to 2:15 p.m. for weekly caucus luncheons. There will be rollcall votes throughout the day and we hope into the night. We have a lot of work to do in the next few days. We need cooperation on both sides to make sure Senators have the opportunity to offer amendments they feel appropriate and to agree to a reasonable time on these.

The Republican leader and I are looking forward to a good debate and opportunities for people to offer amendments. At this stage, there appears to be no limit on the type of amendments offered. We hope people will be considerate of the rest of the Senators and move forward as quickly as we can. We have a lot to do in a little bit of time.

The Presidents Day recess is to begin a week from this Friday, and that recess will not begin unless President Obama has a bill on his desk to sign. I would hope everyone appreciates the fact that we not only have to complete the legislation but we have to work out some kind of arrangement with the House.

I have spoken last night to the Republican leader, and we intend to go to conference on this bill. I hope everyone keeps in mind the time concerns we have.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT OF 2009

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 1, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1) making supplemental appropriations for job preservation and creation, infrastructure investment, energy efficiency and science, assistance to the unemployed, and State and local fiscal stabilization, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2009, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Pending:

Reid (for Inouye-Baucus) amendment No. 98, in the nature of a substitute.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. BAUCUS. Madam President, today, we continue consideration of the economic recovery bill. Our country is facing a serious economic challenge. America is in the middle of the most significant economic downturn in the lifetimes of most Americans, and the bill before us is a serious response.

The Finance and the Appropriations Committees have sought to assemble the most effective tools available to help our economy recover. Ninety-nine percent of the Finance Committee's response will take effect in the first 19 months of the bill. I repeat: 99 percent of the Finance Committee's response will take effect in the first 19 months of the bill.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

Today, we begin work in earnest on the bill. We hope to consider a number of amendments. We have taken extraordinary steps to ensure the Senate is considering this bill with a fair process. We posted the Finance Committee part of the bill on the Internet last Friday, and Chairman INOUYE and I submitted our substitute amendment to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD last Friday as well. So the legislative text of the measure before us has been available for 4 days.

During the Finance Committee's consideration of the bill in committee, we had a thorough and open amendment process. The committee considered the bill over the course of 11 hours. Senators filed more than 200 amendments. The committee voted on 30 amendments.

As we proceed to consideration of the bill on the Senate floor, we also hope to have an open amendment process. We hope it will proceed much as it did on the children's health bill last week. As Senators will recall, last week the Senate considered the children's health bill over the course of 4 days. Senators offered 27 amendments, and the Senate conducted rollcall votes on 14 amendments. I do not believe we turned any Senator away from offering an amendment last week. We had a thorough process, and the Senate passed the children's health bill with an overwhelming 66-to-32 vote.

This week, on the economic recovery bill, we hope once again to process a number of amendments. We intend to begin with an amendment by the Senator from Washington, Senator MURRAY, regarding infrastructure. This afternoon, we expect to consider amendments by Senator MIKULSKI regarding automobiles, Senator BOXER regarding repatriation, and Senator FEINGOLD regarding earmarks.

We hope to consider multiple amendments during the day. This is a significant bill. We have a work product from both the Appropriations and the Finance Committees represented in the pending substitute. Senators INOUYE and COCHRAN will manage the bill for the appropriations matters and Senator GRASSLEY and I will be managing the bill for finance matters.

I urge Senators to let the managers know of their intentions to offer amendments. We will want to make sure the appropriate manager is here to respond to the amendment. As much as possible, we would like to give all Senators notice about what subjects will be coming up. In other words, we are working on possibly grouping subjects so as to give Senators a little more notice and to help make the process a little more orderly.

I thank all Senators for their cooperation, and I look forward to a healthy debate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Madam President, I wish to talk about not just

the stimulus bill but how we need to address this overall economic crisis, which the more we hear about, the worse it gets. If we don't watch out, we are going to be in a downward economic spiral.

Look back to where we got into the mess. Wall Street allowed banks to make too many bad home loans. They were home loans the homeowners could not afford, and many times they were rushed into signing these kinds of agreements when their income level would not support that kind of mortgage. Then Wall Street bundled thousands of those mortgages—sometimes you heard them referred to as subprime—and sold them as a security. Those were bought and sold throughout the financial process, from financial institution to financial institution. They were sold at a profit. There was little or no regulation. Of course, the bankers walked away with billions of dollars in bonuses and the taxpayers now have to clean up the mess.

Well, what began as trouble in the housing market quickly spread to the financial system and, from there, to the economy as a whole. The revenue stream for these mortgages was cut off because people weren't paying their monthly payments on the mortgages, and therefore the revenue from these bundled securities of bad mortgages weren't paying off, and that started rippling through the entire financial system for whoever held those bundled mortgages.

What started as an American problem now has become a global problem. Foreign governments, many of their investors, had invested in these bundled securitized mortgages. Foreign governments have seen their exports decline, and they are finding themselves shut out when they seek loans from the world's banks. The banks aren't lending because they do not have the security of knowledge that those borrowers are going to pay off. Lo and behold, since this thing has spread globally, even to foreign governments, some of the governments may even default on their own debts, which would be a devastating blow for any nation.

That is a story that has yet to be told. We may have foreign governments defaulting on their debts and going into insolvency. Such defaults could clearly pose a national security threat for us, as already fragile governments fall and are replaced by forces that are hostile to American interests.

At the same time, our current economic crisis will soon become a financing problem for our own Government. We are running up a large tab. We are spending nearly \$900 billion in this bill to stimulate the economy. Maybe we are going to have to spend that much again to relieve the banks of the toxic assets—these bad assets that are so underwater—in order to get these toxic assets off the books of the banks.

Well, when you look down the road, it is hard to fathom that we are going to put this financial burden on our

children, but economists—conservative and liberal—across the spectrum agree that the burden could be far worse if we don't take bold and immediate action, as evidenced in what is on the floor of the Senate now. We need to act, we need to act boldly, and we need to act now.

This economic recovery bill that we will consider this week begins to move us in the right direction. Now, there ought to be some tweaks and some iterations on it, and we are going to consider that in the amendatory process, but let's consider the thrust of it. It funds shovel-ready infrastructure—those projects that are ready to go—which are going to strengthen our Nation while creating jobs in the construction sector.

We heard the chairman of the Finance Committee say that over 90 percent of all the spending that occurs as a result of the tax cuts and the tax incentives—he said over 90 percent of all the tax portion of the bill is going to take effect in the first 19 months. Now that is the kind of stimulus we need.

This bill provides health and education assistance to State governments. It protects the most vulnerable, while putting money back into the economy. The legislation before us creates incentives for the private sector to put money into innovative ideas in health care technology, in energy efficiency, and in a smarter electricity grid.

I think this bill moves us in the right direction. But we have to watch out that we do not get sidetracked. We need to make sure we are investing in sectors where the economy is idle, where Americans stand ready to work on the projects we fund. As we debate the bill's tax provisions, we need to make sure they provide incentives for employers to create new well-paying jobs.

I saw something that is disturbing to me. I saw that a group of our Senators is trying to do some cuts in this, and in a publication this morning they singled out NASA, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The chairman of the Appropriations Committee has helped those of us who work in this kind of specialty here before the Senate. What this group of Senators does not realize is that is directly related to job stimulus because of the horrible situation we have ourselves in where we are going to shut down our American vehicle to get to space, the space shuttle, and it is going to be another 5 years, under the present plan, to get the new rocket ready to get to our own space station that we have built and paid for. As a result, the Kennedy Space Center, the Johnson Space Center in Texas, and the Marshall Space Center in Alabama are looking at massive layoffs. My space center in Florida is looking at 5,000 jobs being laid off. The chairman of the Appropriations Committee, who has an insight into this, has provided that money for stimulus for those jobs. So let's keep that

goal in mind—jobs. That is what we want to do with this stimulus bill.

The legislation alone is not going to move us beyond the total problem we are facing, the potential downward spiral. Experts, liberal and conservative, now agree that the Nation's banks are going to need ongoing support at a cost that might exceed what we have committed already. If the banks are going to continue receiving Government support, they must grant taxpayers a meaningful ownership stake. They must boost lending to individuals and to small business, and they must accept real limits on executive compensation.

Of course, there is another story chronicled in this morning's newspapers about how all of these banks have gotten all of these billions of dollars, and that not only has not increased lending, their lending to borrowers has actually decreased. That is unacceptable.

If we provide the banks with more support—and I suspect we are going to have to—in this next tranche of \$350 billion, then we still are going to have to address the mortgage foreclosure crisis, which is the root cause of the current circumstance. We need a credible plan for Government-backed mortgage refinancing, whether it is through Freddie or Fannie, the FDIC, or whether we create a new loan facility that is created specifically for that purpose. I talked to the Secretary of the Treasury three times about this, and I am encouraged that the administration appears to support such a plan.

I am telling you, every one of us knows that our constituents, particularly those near retirement age and retired, are dramatically concerned about the loss of their retirement savings which has accompanied the markets' collapse.

Since the 1980s, what happened? We have seen a shift away from a defined benefit pension, toward a market-based individual retirement account. Many Americans now rely on such accounts as a vital source of retirement income—the IRAs, the 401(k)s—and for those who have reached retirement—and every one of us has a lot of retirees in our State—or for those who hope to retire in the near future, the markets' collapse has delayed or laid waste to their plans, all the while Wall Street executives walk off with billions of dollars in bonuses. These are folks who have worked. They played by the rules. They have saved all of their lives. They deserve our attention more than the bankers who got us into this mess.

I want to quote from an Indiana newspaper, the Evansville Courier. To our colleagues from Indiana, I wish to compliment the editorial from your newspaper on February 2:

The middle class retirees who saved in their IRA and 401(k) plans, and who intended to use their Social Security entitlement to supplement their investment income, and thereby to live out their days in modest comfort, now face the complete loss of that

dream. It was not a dream of luxury, just a hard-won freedom from daily work and maybe a trip to somewhere warm in the winter.

That is what they saved for. And once this economy recovers—and it will, hopefully sooner than many predict—we are still going to have a lot of work that will remain. We need to look at the current causes of our crisis, and we need to better regulate our financial markets. As the economy recovers, we will need to keep a close eye on the Nation's monetary policy. Interest rates now are at historic lows, and our monetary policy is looser than it has been in decades. As we step on the fiscal gas, in addition to the monetary loosening, we need to make sure we do not overshoot the mark and trigger a new period of inflation.

So our problems are many and our options are few. Things may get worse before they get better. If we put aside the differences and reason together, they will get better.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I am going to proceed for a few moments on my leader time.

Evidently, the President had a meeting with House and Senate Democratic leadership last night, impressing upon them, obviously, the urgency of approving a stimulus bill that actually works. But I think it is safe to say that the version House Democrats approved last week certainly does not meet that test. Most of the infrastructure projections it includes would not impact the economy for at least a year.

I was recently talking to my Governor, and he indicated basically that the spend-outs were in year 2 and 3 in much of this, thereby kind of illustrating my point that in terms of immediate impact, it is quite deficient. Worse still, permanent spending—or what we call, inside the Beltway, “entitlement spending”—is actually increased by \$200 billion.

The President has talked on a number of occasions—I know I have spoken with him about it—about my willingness to work with him on a bipartisan basis to get entitlements or permanent spending under control. We know it is going to ruin our country in the near future. This bill, in the name of stimulus, actually increases permanent spending, entitlement spending, by \$200 billion, making an already incredibly difficult problem worse. As everybody—almost everybody—is now fully aware, the House bill was, of course, additionally loaded with wasteful spending. Unfortunately, the version Senate Democrats put forth is not a whole lot better.

President Obama said 75 percent of the bill's discretionary projects should be paid for within 2 years. Yet more than half of the spending in the Senate version would not be spent until after 2 years. President Obama said 40 percent of the bill should be tax relief. Yet less

than one-third of the spending in the Senate version would go to tax relief. And like the House bill, the spending portion in the Senate version is simply way too big. The spending portion is way too big. If you include the interest payments on all of this money we are purportedly about to spend, the Senate Democratic bill is nearly \$1.3 trillion. So I cannot imagine President Obama is terribly pleased with the proposal Democrats in the House or the Senate have put forward at this point. I am hoping he convinced them last night that it is time to put forth, together, a bill that gives an immediate jolt to the economy and creates jobs right now, not a bill that increases permanent spending, not a bill that spends out in years 3 and 4. A stimulus package ought to do something right now to stimulate the economy.

President Obama has acknowledged that Senate Republicans have a number of good ideas that he would like to incorporate into the final bill. So has the senior Senator from New York. Republicans will be pursuing these ideas this week, and how they would help President Obama achieve his goal for the stimulus bill. We Republicans think we can send the President a simpler, more targeted stimulus bill that gets right at the root of our current economic troubles, that does not waste money we do not have on projects that do not create jobs now.

Most people recognize that housing is at the root of the current economic downturn, so we would fix this problem before we do anything else. Republicans believe that one way to do that is to provide a Government-backed, 30-year fixed mortgage at approximately 4 percent to any creditworthy borrower. That would reduce monthly mortgage payments and increase demand for homes. According to this proposal, the average family would see its monthly mortgage payment drop by over \$400 a month. That comes out to over \$5,000 a year. Over the life of a 30-year loan, that is a savings of over \$150,000. That is a proposal to get right at the housing problem now.

Next, in order to get money into the economy quickly, Republicans propose that we cut income tax rates for working Americans right now. The Federal Government imposes a 10-percent tax on married couples for incomes up to \$16,700. By cutting that rate in half, we put \$500 into the pockets of every working family and give an immediate jolt to the country. Incomes between \$16,700 and \$67,900 are taxed at 15 percent. Republicans would cut that rate to 10 percent, putting another \$1,100 into the pockets of working couples. And single filers would get similar rate reductions. In other words, everyone who works and pays income taxes would see an immediate increase in pay. This simpler, targeted plan gets at the root of the problem, which is housing. It puts money into people's pockets immediately.

President Obama asked Congress to put together a bill without wasteful

spending that creates jobs now. We Republicans believe we have better ideas for doing both. We look forward to having the chance to explain these ideas this week to the American people through our amendments, and we look forward to having votes on those amendments in the hope that many of them will pass.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington State is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 110 TO AMENDMENT NO. 98

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I send an amendment to the desk on behalf of myself, Senator FEINSTEIN, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. REID, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. DODD, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BEGICH, and Mr. REED of Rhode Island, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Washington [Mrs. MURRAY], for herself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. REID, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. DODD, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BEGICH, and Mr. REED of Rhode Island, proposes an amendment numbered 110 to amendment No. 98.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment (No. 110) is as follows:

(Purpose: To strengthen the infrastructure investments made by the bill)

Beginning on page 118, line 4, strike “\$6,400,000,000, to remain available” and all that follows through “\$2,000,000,000 shall be for” and insert in-lieu thereof “\$13,400,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2010, of which \$10,000,000,000 shall be for making capitalization grants for the Clean Water State Revolving Funds under title VI of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended; of which \$3,000,000,000 shall be for”.

On page 232, line 16, insert “and other surface transportation” prior to the word “investment”.

On page 232, line 20, strike “\$27,060,000,000” and insert “\$40,060,000,000”.

On page 239, line 24, strike “\$8,400,000,000” and insert “\$10,400,000,000”.

On page 242, after line 10, insert the following:

SUPPLEMENTAL GRANTS FOR FIXED GUIDEWAY MODERNIZATION

For an additional amount for capital expenditures authorized under section 5309(b)(2), \$2,000,000,000, to remain available through September 30, 2010: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Transportation shall apportion the funding provided under this heading using the formula set forth in subsection 5337(a)(7) of title 49, United States Code: *Provided further*, That the federal share of the costs for which a grant is made under this heading shall be at the option of the recipient, and may be up to 100 percent: *Provided further*, That the funds appropriated under this heading shall not be commingled with funds available under the Formula and Bus Grants account.

SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDS FOR CAPITAL INVESTMENT GRANTS

For an additional amount for “Capital Investment Grants” as authorized under section 5338(c)(4) of title 49, United States Code, and allocated under section 5309(m)(2)(A) of such title, to enable the Secretary of Transportation to make discretionary grants as authorized by section 5309(d) and (e) of such title, \$1,000,000,000, to remain available through September 30, 2011: *Provided*, That in awarding grants with funding provided under this heading, the Secretary shall give priority to projects that the grant funding can expedite their completion and their entry into revenue service: *Provided further*, That such funding shall be allocated without regard to the requirements of section 5309(m)(2)(A)(i) of title 49, United States Code: *Provided further*, That the federal share of the costs for which a grant is made under this heading shall be at the option of the recipient, and may be up to 100 percent: *Provided further*, That the funds appropriated under this heading shall not be commingled with funds available under the Capital Investment Grants account.

Each amount provided in this amendment is designated as an emergency requirement and necessary to meet emergency needs pursuant to section 204(a) of S. Con. Res. 21 (110th Congress) and section 301(b)(2) of S. Con. Res. 70 (110th Congress), the concurrent resolutions on the budget for fiscal years 2008 and 2009.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, last year was tragic for workers who lost their jobs and their homes in this economic crisis. Through no fault of their own, millions of people are now wondering where they are going to find the next dollar to pay for groceries or to keep a roof over their heads. For them, putting money away to save for college or for a secure retirement is simply a dream. It is clear we need to take bold action to get us through this recession and back on the road to economic recovery. I believe the American recovery and reinvestment plan now before the Senate is that kind of bold investment.

Before I continue, I particularly congratulate our new Appropriations chairman, Senator INOUYE, and commend him for his management and tre-

mendous work on getting this bill and this part of it to the floor. He has always shown evenhandedness and poise, as he has managed dozens of bills on the Commerce and Appropriations Committees. We are very fortunate to have him as our chairman on the Appropriations Committee, helping us with this critical piece of legislation. I also thank our former chairman and ranking member for his long dedication to the Appropriations Committee, Senator COCHRAN. I truly appreciate his contribution to this committee.

I rise to offer an amendment that will make this good bill even better by boosting our investment in infrastructure and creating thousands more good-paying American jobs. Our economy needs a jolt. We have to create jobs, and we have to get commerce going again. I believe one of the best ways we can do that and bring stability to communities is by investing in construction projects throughout the entire country. The amendment I offer today will get more than 650,000 Americans back to work by injecting \$25 billion into our highways and roads, mass transit systems, and water and sewer networks.

Investing in construction projects is the tried and true way to put people back to work. My amendment not only supports over 650,000 jobs, it supports the kind of good-paying jobs we desperately need to help families put meals on the table or send their kids to school or save a little money for retirement. These are also the jobs our State Governors and local mayors say they are praying for to help their communities. States and municipalities have felt the economic crisis particularly hard. They have had to make some painful cuts and layoffs. They are even canceling projects now under way to conserve cash. This weekend Governor Granholm from Michigan told CNN that her State could “have dirt flying within 180 days” if we pass a bill that increases Federal infrastructure investments.

With the amendment we are offering today, States such as Michigan could create jobs as fast as they are able to spend the money, and thousands of people in all 50 States would benefit. It would support, for example, more than 18,000 jobs in Georgia, 27,600 jobs in Florida, over 20,000 jobs in Michigan, more than 13,000 jobs in the State of Washington, to name a few.

I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a chart that displays what this will do for every State.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Formula Funding and Jobs Impact by the Infrastructure Amendment:

State	Highway Funding in HR 1	Highway Amdt Increase	Total Highway	Highway Jobs Increased by Amdt	Highway Jobs Total Increase	Funding in HR 1	Transit Increase	Transit Jobs Increased by Amdt	Transit Jobs Total Increase
ALABAMA	510,388,740	250,492,813	760,881,553	6,969	21,170	59,888,932	14,421,357	401	2,088
ALASKA	132,440,000	65,000,000	197,440,000	1,808	5,493	48,076,829	54,931,671	1,530	2,868
ARIZONA	502,431,243	246,587,366	748,018,609	6,861	20,840	122,061,635	36,465,319	1,015	4,411
ARKANSAS	360,744,049	177,048,952	537,793,001	4,926	14,963	37,033,479	8,938,947	249	1,279
CALIFORNIA	2,554,367,859	1,253,653,811	3,808,021,670	34,880	105,951	1,162,211,543	652,734,249	18,161	50,497
COLORADO	425,788,184	208,971,861	634,750,035	5,814	17,661	122,052,228	46,803,370	1,302	4,659
CONNECTICUT	243,835,864	119,671,785	363,507,649	3,330	10,114	162,927,982	72,746,633	2,024	6,557
DELAWARE	132,440,000	65,000,000	197,440,000	1,808	5,493	27,286,636	6,515,772	181	941
DIST. OF COL.	132,440,000	65,000,000	197,440,000	1,808	5,493	122,586,981	193,941,707	316,538,698	8,807
FLORIDA	1,342,640,241	658,952,097	2,001,592,338	18,334	55,690	372,195,353	141,533,561	513,428,924	14,285
GEORGIA	897,639,463	440,550,929	1,338,190,392	12,257	37,232	167,603,802	107,958,818	275,202,620	2,994
HAWAII	132,440,000	65,000,000	197,440,000	1,808	5,493	50,232,841	16,301,740	66,534,381	454
IDAHO	184,198,222	80,586,563	244,784,785	2,242	6,811	23,561,410	5,692,181	158	815
ILLINOIS	945,433,022	464,007,448	1,409,440,470	12,910	39,215	430,055,025	253,044,431	683,059,456	7,040
INDIANA	627,200,608	307,822,709	935,023,317	8,565	26,015	97,583,872	34,759,939	132,343,811	906
IOWA	359,442,980	191,134,051	580,577,031	5,318	16,153	46,042,812	11,086,317	57,129,129	308
KANSAS	401,224,409	196,916,238	598,140,647	5,479	16,642	39,363,817	9,488,376	48,852,193	264
KENTUCKY	419,754,610	206,010,644	625,765,254	5,732	17,411	63,547,851	15,284,526	78,832,377	425
LOUISIANA	425,063,478	208,616,174	633,679,652	5,804	17,631	77,378,064	21,223,317	96,001,381	590
MAINE	153,323,210	65,433,459	198,756,679	1,821	5,530	17,347,953	4,196,024	21,543,937	117
MARYLAND	419,971,070	206,116,880	626,087,950	5,735	17,420	240,852,636	109,349,630	350,202,266	3,042
MASSACHUSETTS	408,467,809	200,471,214	608,939,023	5,578	16,943	386,246,819	86,690,351	572,937,170	5,194
MICHIGAN	854,623,988	434,163,092	1,318,787,070	12,080	56,693	165,008,430	41,137,803	206,146,233	1,145
MINNESOTA	275,712,965	837,498,730	1,205,210,725	7,671	23,301	111,216,046	50,851,244	162,067,290	1,415
MISSISSIPPI	187,633,655	569,944,444	759,578,399	5,221	15,858	34,033,125	8,241,128	42,274,253	229
MISSOURI	313,263,269	951,549,228	1,264,812,297	8,716	26,475	103,046,085	41,991,326	145,037,411	1,168
MONTANA	168,879,449	82,593,017	250,879,466	2,298	6,980	19,986,041	4,848,534	24,805,457	135
NEBRASKA	98,928,392	384,489,653	473,817,045	3,522	10,688	29,315,457	7,062,324	36,377,781	196
NEVADA	201,570,404	300,498,796	501,068,100	2,752	8,361	59,622,016	14,262,865	73,884,881	397
NEW HAMPSHIRE	132,440,000	65,000,000	197,440,000	1,808	5,493	16,935,918	4,073,977	21,009,895	113
NEW JERSEY	586,875,196	874,371,229	1,458,747,225	8,009	24,328	63,728,487	265,975,271	899,703,768	7,400
NEW MEXICO	245,711,000	366,303,083	612,092,003	3,356	10,192	34,890,008	8,410,962	43,300,970	234
NEW YORK	982,306,143	487,012,226	1,479,318,369	13,550	41,159	1,199,256,100	728,153,121	1,927,408,221	53,626
NORTH CAROLINA	729,907,072	358,229,838	1,088,136,910	9,967	30,275	131,121,337	32,082,348	163,203,685	893
NORTH DAKOTA	160,774,985	78,906,479	239,681,464	2,195	6,669	13,708,018	3,315,262	17,023,280	92
OHIO	914,598,673	1,363,472,984	2,326,071,053	12,488	37,936	203,034,842	66,975,038	270,009,895	1,863
OKLAHOMA	499,511,701	744,666,190	1,245,154,489	6,821	20,719	50,170,037	12,082,832	62,252,869	1,732
OREGON	344,745,050	169,196,831	513,941,881	4,708	14,299	89,446,876	44,881,447	134,328,323	1,737
PENNSYLVANIA	887,060,671	440,266,865	1,337,327,536	12,250	37,208	310,788,849	159,260,776	470,049,625	4,431
RHODE ISLAND	132,440,000	65,000,000	197,440,000	1,808	5,493	49,330,420	12,424,891	61,371,700	673
SOUTH CAROLINA	482,314,809	236,714,456	719,029,265	6,586	20,006	53,668,016	12,913,846	66,601,862	335
SOUTH DAKOTA	182,487,252	89,562,605	272,049,857	2,492	7,569	14,487,321	3,504,543	17,961,864	98
TEXAS	2,263,162,957	284,050,875	3,110,733,858	862,815,458	7,903	59,888,932	90,597,655	113,893,365	648
UTAH	222,407,496	109,154,993	337,386,815	30,904	93,872	482,188,117	154,891,589	607,079,706	4,310
VERMONT	132,440,000	65,000,000	197,440,000	1,808	5,493	69,168,919	24,202,781	93,371,700	673
VIRGINIA	689,908,574	343,506,926	1,043,415,500	9,557	29,031	136,610,971	80,168,270	216,779,241	2,231
WASHINGTON	495,069,722	242,974,418	738,044,140	6,760	20,535	201,280,291	127,484,908	328,765,199	3,547
WEST VIRGINIA	197,039,259	96,704,559	293,743,818	2,691	8,173	23,808,878	8,401,360	32,210,238	234
WISCONSIN	537,075,284	263,590,255	800,665,539	7,334	22,277	99,839,633	26,503,931	126,343,564	737
WYOMING	132,440,000	65,000,000	197,440,000	1,808	5,493	11,869,051	2,886,452	14,755,503	80

Mrs. MURRAY. But this amendment doesn't only help the economy today by creating new jobs. This amendment will literally pave the way for future economic growth across the country. These investments will help communities provide cleaner drinking water and roads that are free of congestion. They will help create modern railroads that will get workers to their jobs more quickly and safely. They will help improve our ports so they are more efficient and more competitive. We all know businesses need good transportation and stable water and sewer systems. Less traffic means more productivity, cleaner air, and a stronger economy. These investments will pay off for years to come because communities will be stronger and more competitive in the global economy.

Finally, this amendment is critically needed because roads, bridges, and water and sewer systems are literally falling apart. Year after year, we have had to put off repairs, while we have spent billions of dollars in the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. In August of 2007, we all stood aghast and watched in horror as the I-35W bridge in Minneapolis collapsed into the Mississippi River. That tragedy brought home to everyone how critical it is that we invest in the national highway system.

Last week, we had another reminder when the American Society of Civil Engineers issued its annual report card on the condition of America's infrastructure. The results were truly dismal. The leading experts on the state of our Nation's infrastructure have reduced the grade point average of our entire system of roads and bridges and transit and sewer plants to a D. Let me make it clear, that was a D average for all of the Nation's infrastructure. Several specific areas which I am targeting in the amendment did even worse. Waste-water treatment systems, on which I have worked with Senator FEINSTEIN, got a D-minus. The engineers pointed out that leaking pipes across the country lose an estimated 7 billion gallons of drinking water each and every day. The Nation's roads got a D-minus since a third of the major roads are considered to be in poor or mediocre condition. More than a third of urban highways are congested. American families now spend about 4.2 billion hours each year stuck in traffic. That is costing the economy almost \$80 billion every single year. These are roads in every one of the States. It is time to fix them.

Our transit systems only got a D, but that is still not acceptable. With riderhip skyrocketing, it could get worse, if we don't make the upgrades and improvements so dramatically needed.

Speaking as a mom and a former teacher, a D-minus or a D is not going to cut it. As far as I am concerned, when it comes to infrastructure, a D stands for disappointment. A D means demand change, demand attention, and demand investment.

The amendment I have offered is going to help us address these defi-

ciencies head on and put over 655,000 Americans back to work. For any of my colleagues who are worried about whether we can spend infrastructure dollars fast enough, I want to be clear: More than a million workers across the country are today ready and able to start tomorrow. The unemployment rate in the construction industry is now just under 16 percent. More than 1.5 million construction workers are out of a job, a 54-percent increase over a year ago. Skilled workers all across the country are now forced to try to pick up whatever odd jobs they can to pay for their week's groceries. This amendment is about bringing jobs back to those workers and stability to their families and making the kinds of investments America has ignored for too long.

I am proposing in the amendment that we invest another \$25 billion in this bill, bringing the total spending on infrastructure to \$167 billion. My amendment would increase transportation investments from \$45.5 billion to more than \$63.5 billion, with the largest boost going to highway construction. It would give all States and communities the equivalent of 2 years of Federal highway contributions at once, enabling them to support 362,000 construction jobs alone, and another \$5 billion would go to mass transit, supporting 139,000 jobs. Senator FEINSTEIN will discuss how it will increase water and sewer grants within the Environmental Protection Agency by \$7 billion, supporting 154,000 new jobs.

It is a scary time for millions of families across America. They are extremely worried about their stability and the future of their families. They are worried about how they will pay their bills and whether they will be able to keep their homes. They have put their faith in all of us and in our new President to set us on a path that will not only turn things around but leave our country stronger and more resilient than ever. Today they are watching this debate, and they are expecting us to take bold, swift action to get us started. This amendment is that kind of bold action. It supports 655,000 new, good-paying jobs. It will help us rebuild roads, bridges, mass transit networks, water and sewer systems that we have neglected for too long. Most importantly, these investments will leave communities stronger and more secure in the future.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment and help put thousands of American workers back on the job and the country back on its feet.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. INOUYE. Will the Senator yield?

Mrs. MURRAY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. INOUYE. I am extremely impressed by the Senator's presentation. I am proud to say that I support the measure. It will provide 655,000 new jobs. As the boys in the back room would say: This is just what the doctor ordered. Congratulations.

Mrs. MURRAY. I thank the Senator. The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UDALL of New Mexico). The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, the matter before this body is the majority's stimulus bill. It merges the products of last week's markup in the Finance Committee and the Appropriations Committee. Twenty-three Senators were involved in the Finance Committee markup. In that group, there were 13 Democrats, 10 Republicans. Thirty Senators were involved in the other committee's markup, the Appropriations Committee. In that group, there were 17 Democrats and 13 Republicans. So if we add that up, it means over half the Senate has been involved in either the Finance Committee part or the Appropriations Committee part of this legislation. For the first time, however, all Senators will have to consider this very large and complicated piece of legislation. That started yesterday and will go on for a week. So the public who want to follow Congress will have a long time to follow the issue.

We ought to take that sort of time with an \$800, almost \$900 billion piece of legislation. First, I will discuss process and then focus on substance. Because I am the senior Republican on the Finance Committee, I will focus on the Finance Committee's portion. I, like 69 other Senators, am still studying the Appropriations Committee part.

First, I thank my friend from Montana, Chairman BAUCUS, for courteously and professionally consulting Members on this side. We had one bipartisan Members' meeting where Chairman BAUCUS patiently heard all of us out. In addition, Chairman BAUCUS apprised me of the negotiations between Democratic leadership of both bodies and the Obama administration. Those Democrats-only negotiations were extensive. Folks on our side who read press reports could see how extensive they were. Further evidence of that deal making is the relatively small differences between the basic structure of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Finance Committee of the Senate. I congratulate Chairman BAUCUS on those negotiations. The fruit of that labor is the Finance Committee package.

One significant change followed a recommendation I made in early January. That change was made in committee. That was the addition of the alternative minimum tax patch for this year which means over 24 million families need not worry about an average tax increase of at least \$2,000 per family for this year. But let no one be mistaken that this bill is the result of bipartisan negotiations. While Republicans were courteously consulted at the Member and staff level, we were never at the negotiating table. Speaker PELOSI best described the bottom line of the process from the Washington

Post, dated Friday January 23, when she said:

Yes, we wrote the bill. Yes, we won the election.

Indeed, there was a rumor floating around about an informal agreement among Democratic Members. The agreement appeared to be to vote against any Republican amendments, no matter what the merits of the amendments might be. As proof of that, if one would review the markup, they will find that nearly all Republican amendments were defeated on a virtually party-line vote. They will also find, for the first time in recent Finance Committee tax legislative history, small issues or modifications raised by dissenting Members, with a couple exceptions. I thank the leadership for those exceptions. None of these smaller issues were even accommodated.

So let's be clear. We knew at the outset the markup would be ratifying a deal made between Democratic leaders of the House and Senate: No Republican ideas need apply. With the exception of that AMT patch amendment, this was the basic outcome.

Since the largely partisan markup process finished, we have been told by the President and members of the Democratic leadership that this bill is open to improvement by amendment, and I am hopeful we will see that follow through, and before the day is over, I am sure we are going to have some votes where we can do that.

If I could define "bipartisanship" just for a minute, I would define it kind of the way I have seen it work over the past decade in the Finance Committee but probably other committees do the same thing. Days before you want to bring up a bill, you sit down and you negotiate between the two leaders, and maybe other people, but you consider every member's position to some extent, and you come out with what is called a bipartisan mark.

In our committee, for some times that was Grassley-Baucus, for other times it was Baucus-Grassley. It is a little bit like buying a new car. If it is going to be a family operation, CHUCK GRASSLEY does not go up to Barbara Grassley and say: I have made a determination that we are going to buy a Ford Taurus, and it is going to be blue, and it is going to have these accessories, et cetera, et cetera. No. You sit down. CHUCK and Barbara GRASSLEY sit down, and we decide what color car do we want, what brand do we want, what do we want for accessories, et cetera, et cetera. And you go to the dealer, and you have a uniform family position of what kind of a car you buy.

That is the way bipartisanship ought to work here. That is the way I define it. That is the way it has worked over a long period of time. But it is not the way it worked in the product we have before us.

Now we have the President of the United States saying to leaders of his party, when they meet at the White

House: Republicans have good ideas, and we want to work toward bipartisanship. Now we have a process in place. Will the President's leadership make a difference to the majority party here on Capitol Hill?

Before I get into substance, though, I wish to pull back and talk about the larger picture for a couple minutes. Majority Leader REID opened debate on this bill yesterday. Yesterday we also had Groundhog Day. My first chart is a depiction of Punxsutawney Phil, that famous weather forecaster there in Pennsylvania. Yesterday, Phil saw his shadow. Groundhog Day is a recurring event. "Groundhog Day" is also the title of a famous film starring Bill Murray.

I have another picture for you of Phil and Bill driving along. In the movie "Groundhog Day," Bill Murray finds himself continually repeating the same routine. Now, my friend, Chairman BAUCUS, last year rightly pointed out the message of the film. The message was that Bill, guided by Phil, eventually had to figure out what he was doing wrong. Once Bill figured it out, he escaped the infinite loop.

On this bill before us, we need to learn from Bill's and Phil's adventure. We cannot and we should not legislate in a hasty manner and place ourselves in an infinite loop of repeating the same exercise. Democrats and Republicans and the President need to get this right, particularly in the time of the terrible economic recession we are in. We cannot casually deficit spend and ask American taxpayers to clean up the fiscal mess with high taxes down the road.

To me, there is a particularly compelling irony to the fact that we are debating another stimulus bill at roughly the same Groundhog Day timeframe. One year ago, almost to this exact date, the Senate spent a week debating an economic stimulus package. The target time set for enacting legislation was similar to the one for this package. I am talking about the Presidents Day recess. Let's keep the Groundhog Day irony in mind as we move forward this week and next week. Let's not repeat the same exercise, except this time with even much bigger dollars. Let's get it right.

Now to substance. I want to make it clear that most on our side agree with President Obama that stimulus is necessary. The economy is flat on its back. Too many Americans who want to find work cannot find those jobs. A lot of Americans are worried their job will be the next to go. We get that on our side. Everyone here knows we need to do everything we can to get the economy moving again. Where we differ between parties is the degree to which the engine ought to be Government or the engine ought to be the private sector, especially America's biggest job creator, our small business sector, where you hear quite regularly from economists that 70, 80 percent of the new jobs are created. In fact, in the

year 2007, big business created no new jobs. All the new jobs in 2007 were created by small business.

These are honest, well-intentioned, philosophical differences between our two parties: Government or the private sector. But those are differences that are there. On our side, we want the new jobs to come from the private sector. On the other side, the preference is to grow employment through an expansion of Government.

Many on the other side and opinion makers who agree with them are invoking the example of Iowa-born President Hoover. Iowa is my home State. They seem to be doing it to portray anyone who questions the trillion-dollar package as a reincarnation of what we call Hoover economics. It is an unfair characterization. Again, let's be clear. Folks on our side recognize the need for action. So do not accuse us of Hooverism.

Also, though Iowans are rightly respectful of the only Iowan to be President, President Hoover, you have to recognize history. I would instruct the other side on a couple lessons from the Hoover era, too, where President Hoover was wrong. One lesson: Do not obstruct free trade. The highest tariff levels in the history of this country—the Smoot-Hawley tariffs—were enacted in the middle of his Presidency, and it shut down world trade. We have to think about that right now because the latest reports have the first reversal of the growth of trade worldwide since 1982. There is little doubt those protectionist barriers that were put up in 1930 or 1931 made the Great Depression worse. So let's not repeat that mistake. There is some evidence on the other side of the aisle that they do want to repeat that mistake and build up protectionist walls.

Now, there is another lesson from the Hoover era I want the other side to be aware of. President Hoover signed into law significant tax increases that made that Depression worse. Like high tariffs, economic history tells us that these burdensome taxes retarded the economy's ability to recover—a recovery that did not happen until World War II came along. We do not want war to get us out of a recession.

On this side, we agree the lessons from the Hoover era need to be learned. We cannot be passive. President Hoover was passive. Errors of omission on fiscal stimulus should be avoided by all of us. Likewise, errors of commission on fiscal stimulus, such as impeding free trade and raising taxes, also should be avoided.

By the conclusion of this debate, those differences will be plain to people at the grassroots of America. I will tell you, all you have to do is go to Iowa, go to church on Sunday, go eat at the Village Inn after church with your family, go to a University of Northern Iowa basketball game, and talk to your neighbors. The public knows what is going on here. They see this as a big spending bill and not a stimulus bill.

We will see differences fleshed out in the debate and on the amendments. That is the way it should be. As I indicated above, most on our side want to improve this bill. Our amendments, large and small, will be offered as improvements. We hope the other side is sincere and will follow our President's admonition yesterday in their desire to change the bill in a way that can garner a bipartisan majority. Whether Republicans or Democrats have been in control, the test of proper stimulus boils down to three words.

That famous Harvard economist, former Secretary of the Treasury, a good person, Larry Summers, had this to say that ought to be a lesson for both political parties:

As with any potent medicine, stimulus, if misadministered, could do more harm than good by increasing instability and creating long run problems. A stimulus program should be timely, targeted, and temporary.

He may not be an MD, but there is a lesson from that Ph.D. we can learn. It is a lesson of medicine: First, do no harm. Well, we want to measure this bill according to what Dr. Summers says. If you apply the three "T's" test to much of the spending in this proposal, you will find it fails the test. We will get into that when we examine and debate the bill.

Some folks might ask: What is the problem if we overshoot and flunk the test? The first problem is running out of budget room. The bill before us will, when interest costs are included, add up beyond that \$900 billion to \$1.3 trillion added to the deficit. All of this extra deficit increase would be proposed when the baseline deficit for this fiscal year will hit \$1.2 trillion. That amount exceeds all historical records. As a percentage of our economy, that will mean 8.3 percent of gross domestic product.

I have read some economists saying that is more stimulus than we have ever had in the history of this country. Maybe 8.3 percent is enough. I think in a bipartisan way, and with the President, we concluded it is not enough. But above that, it seems to me, we ought to be cautious and make sure it is timely, temporary, and targeted because this amount of 8.3 percent easily exceeds the 5.7 percent in 1983. It is almost 50 percent above any comparable post-World War II levels.

The figures on Federal debt held by the public are likewise staggering. In the period of 2001 to 2007, debt held by the public increased by comparatively smaller amounts, roughly 1 percent per year. This year's change easily exceeds all of that, as you can see from this chart of how the deficit continues to go up. You also see it there, as a percent of gross national product, higher than it has been for a 40-year average.

So we need to acknowledge the deficit situation we are in. It is very serious. So whatever we do, we ought to not make the long-term fiscal situation worse than it is. You can see from this chart in the outyears how bad that situation is going to be.

The other problem is if we prime the pump too much and the pumped-out stimulus does not materialize until after the hoped-for recovery is upon us, then we might risk too much stimulus. The result could be inflation.

Let's look at the timely part of Dr. Summers' statement. That needs to be brought into sharper focus. The Congressional Budget Office tells us that less than half of the appropriations amounts will be spent out by the end of fiscal year 2010. So only half of the spending in the bill is timely. The Finance package does a little better. Ironically, the tax policy stimulus, much maligned by the hardcore of both Democratic caucuses, helps the spend-out ratio greatly in the Finance package.

The theory for erring on the side of overloading the spending side is that we need to direct dollars to the folks most likely to spend them. This is the reason we are told we need extra FMAP money, expanded entitlements, and other State aid.

It misses the point that the U.S. fiscal policy system already has an arsenal of antirecessionary automatic stabilizers directed to the very same populations. These stabilizers provide immediate assistance to those most vulnerable who have been hit by an economic downturn. The Congressional Budget Office says that these benefits, including food stamps, unemployment insurance, and Medicaid, will grow to \$250 billion this year. That built-in, lower income-population stimulus will be equal to 1.8 percent of gross national product.

It also misses the point, when you argue that you ought to err on the side of overspending, about ensuring that the lessons of moral hazards apply to the States. The fiscal problems faced by many of our States and localities are largely the result of their inability to keep spending in line with revenue. Between the third quarter of 2006 and the third quarter of 2008, State revenues increased 7 percent and State spending increased twice that amount—15 percent. In other words, the States and localities spent \$2.22 for each additional dollar of revenue. The States have been on a spending spree, and they have dug themselves into a hole.

Now, we will hear that the Medicaid money we are adding—which I refer to as a slush fund for States—is necessary to avoid tax increases at the State and local level. We will also hear that vital services will be cut unless we cut a big blank check to States. Just as we did during the Finance Committee markup, some on our side will test these assumptions with amendments on these points. An open-ended slush fund is not targeted. It is not going to bring about sound, responsible fiscal policy in the States that need it, and this is true no matter how you dress up this issue.

Perhaps the most disturbing stimulus test failure is on the third "t"—that it should be temporary. This is

what bothers me most about this bill. I am referring, of course, to the temporary test. In this package, there are many new popular spending programs labeled "temporary." Those programs total \$140 billion. If these programs are extended or made permanent, we can expect another \$1.3 trillion added to future deficits. I will challenge anyone on the other side to tell me these programs will be turned off once enacted. With large Democratic majorities and a Democratic President, I would say any such promise is dubious in this Congress. It is about as deliverable as a promise to sell the Brooklyn Bridge.

Just so appropriators don't get too far out on a limb, I wish to quote from what Chairman MILLER of one of the House committees had to say. He was talking about these built-in expenditures that are going to go beyond the 2 years; things that ought to be handled by the Appropriations Committee on an annual basis, considering all of the priorities that come to us from all segments of the economy and from all government programs. If you think you are building this into the base, this is Chairman MILLER—I am going to quote here from Congress Daily:

Chairman Miller in the House was asked about the fact that funding for education programs disappears in two years, and he said the word he got from the Obama administration is that these funding levels will NOT become the baseline and that in two years, we can expect that the President's Budget Request will be lower than these new levels. That means schools will see a short-term jump for these programs, but any teacher or programs they put in place may be cut in two years.

Now, let me just ask my colleagues about that. Is it smart to use something that is absolutely needed—a stimulus bill—for an excuse to jack up spending well into the future? That is going to be done in 1 week. Isn't that something appropriations committees generally take several months to do before they make decisions to go down that road? That is something for my colleagues to consider.

To sum it up, this package meets a different three t's test. We start with trillion-dollar deficits. We have a bill that, with interest added, adds more than another trillion dollars to future deficits. We have a bill that has new spending ostensibly labeled as "temporary" but likely to be extended, that bakes into the cake another \$1 trillion of future deficits. Passing this three t's—as in trillions—test ought to be a Senator's pause, and we hope during this debate that pause happens. From our side's view, these are major shortcomings on the substance.

Although we saw execution of a deal to vote down our amendments in committee no matter whether our ideas were meritorious or not, we would like to be and will be constructive, and we will build on parts of the package that we support. But make no mistake about it, we are going to try to use Dr. Summers' guideline of, first, do no harm—he didn't say that—but the

three t's test he put on the chart from his quotation. In other words, we hope our amendments will be more openly received on the Senate floor than they were in committee.

In this respect, we will go back to major differences between the parties on how to get the economy moving. On our side, we would like to push more incentives for long-term growth of private sector jobs. There is a good start on a broad-based middle-income tax cut in the package. We would like to expand the tax cut to cover all middle-income taxpayers.

During this fall's campaign, the President described as middle class families making less than \$250,000. Many of the tax cuts don't apply to millions of families making less than \$250,000. It doesn't make sense to me to call a proposal a middle-class tax cut if it doesn't apply to millions of middle-class families. We would like to direct that at labor and capital income earned by middle-income taxpayers.

Since we weren't at the negotiating table to offer these pro-growth ideas, you will see them arise as constructive offers to improve the package.

I wish to speak for just a minute to some health provisions in the bill.

Spending in this bill should be judged based on two criteria: Will it stimulate the economy, and is the money being well spent? In committee, we aired our honest disagreements over whether several of these provisions were actually stimulative. Improving health information technology is critical for health care infrastructure. I support many of those provisions, but I have to ask: Will it stimulate our economy, and is this money we should add to the deficit rather than offsetting it?

It wasn't so long ago that \$16 billion was a lot of money around here. Providing assistance to States makes sense if we are concerned about States raising taxes or cutting spending. But is \$87 billion the right number, and is increasing Medicaid spending the right way to do it beyond what is necessary to take care of the millions of people who are going to lose their health insurance? That is a much smaller figure; somewhere around \$10 billion to \$12 billion rather than \$87 billion. Could we better stimulate economic recovery using all or part of that money elsewhere?

The Finance Committee package also includes a 2-year extension of our current Trade Adjustment Assistance Programs. I am working with the chairman to see if we can agree with our counterparts on the House Ways and Means Committee on a broader reauthorization of these programs, but that is still a work in progress.

Apart from trade adjustment assistance, I am disappointed that this administration isn't focusing on trade as a component of an economic stimulus package. As I said, we should heed an important lesson from the Hoover era. Economic growth comes from expanding free trade, not contracting it, be-

cause protectionism in the 1930s brought us to World War II. Opening new markets for U.S. exporters should be a part of the mindset to stimulate our economy.

Right now, 20,000 people are being laid off from Caterpillar. I don't think John Deere has laid off very many yet, but 22 percent of John Deere workers have their jobs because of international trade—tractors made in Waterloo, IA, getting on boats in Baltimore to go overseas. We don't want to shut down those kinds of jobs, and without emphasis upon trade being a very important part of a stimulus package, we are sending a message that trade does not matter. Trade does matter. For instance, we have these pending agreements with Colombia, Panama, and South Korea which would provide significant opportunity to do just that, and they should be implemented as soon as possible.

As we go through the bill, our side will offer several amendments that I hope will be accepted to try to make the bill better and answer the questions I and other Members have raised. The people back home see Congress spending vast amounts of taxpayers' money. They are counting on us to ensure their money is spent wisely and not wastefully, and that means to make sure this is a stimulus bill and not a "porkulus" bill.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I will be very brief. I know the Senator from California wishes to make a statement.

Very briefly, I might just say first how much I enjoy working with my good friend, Senator GRASSLEY from Iowa. He is a joy to work with. I know of no finer Senator. He is a man of his word. He is a man of integrity and good will. He is a terrific Senator. I have enjoyed working with him on the committee in many respects.

I also wish to thank him for his kind words about the openness with which I have attempted to conduct the committee. I also wish to commend him for his AMT amendment to make sure Americans don't pay more taxes over the next year. The amendment he offered, as well as the Senator from New Jersey, Mr. MENENDEZ—the two of them offering the amendment was the right thing to do. Some have suggested we drop that amendment. I vigorously resisted that because I think it is a good idea that we have the AMT patch.

There are other provisions in here which remind all of us to help taxpayers. One is extending the small business expensing provision for 2 years. That is going to help small business. That also included an entire threshold that was enacted last year. Added to that, we have payback periods for net operating loss extended from 2 years to 5 years, as well as business tax credits extended from 2 years to 5 years. So businesses can carry

back losses with respect to credits they have otherwise earned, whether it is an R&D tax credit or an energy credit.

So I want to continue working with the good Senator from Iowa as we improve this bill. I do not know whether I agree with all of the amendments some Senators on his side of the aisle will be offering, but we will certainly do our very best to keep improving the bill. There are some very good tax provisions in here to help individual taxpayers and business taxpayers.

So I just wish to thank the Senator for working with us on this.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment Senator MURRAY has just sent to the desk which would add \$25 billion to the infrastructure portion of the bill. I thank her for her work on this amendment.

I also thank the chairman of the committee, Senator INOUYE. Senator INOUYE became chairman of the committee approximately 1 week before this bill came out of committee, so it really represents a great deal of work in a very short period of time, and I believe he is to be commended for that.

In my view, as a former mayor, a stimulus means job production, very simply. As this bill stands, only 16 percent of the stimulus package goes toward infrastructure, which is the physical basis on which a nation's economy functions, while 39 percent would finance tax cuts.

To be very candid with you, I am one of those who do not believe tax cuts are necessarily stimulative. The reason I don't believe that is because I believe the buying habits of Americans in this particular crisis have changed. I don't think \$80 a month in the form of a tax credit is going to change that. We put \$135 billion out in a rebate, and less than 15 percent of it, it was estimated—by the best chance—went into the economy. So I really worry that this package is tax cut heavy and doesn't do what it should do with respect to the production of jobs to repair this physical base on which a nation's economy can function.

The amendment, as Senator MURRAY said, is cosponsored by 21 of us. I very much appreciate all of the Senators' support. It adds \$18 billion for highway and rail. Those of you who have ridden high-speed rail from Tokyo and Osaka know that it was built in the mid-sixties. Here we are in 2009, and we don't have a real high-speed rail, either by MAGLEV or steel wheel, anywhere in this country today. If you travel through Europe, you travel on fast trains. If you go from Pudong in Shanghai to the airport by transit, you can take a MAGLEV system, which does 30 miles in less than 20 minutes. Our highways are jammed. People go to work in gridlock. The newspaper this morning reported that metropolitan Washington, D.C. has some of the highest commuter travel times in America.

We need to repair this infrastructure, and the beauty of doing it as part of this package is that it puts people to work immediately on projects that are shovel ready. So I believe \$18 billion in this bill, which is for highway and rail, and an additional \$7 billion in revolving loan funds for clean water and sewer projects is really necessary. You might say: \$25 billion—what does that do in this package? I will tell you what it does. It raises the percentage of infrastructure from 16 to 19 percent. That is all it does. That is how big this package is and how little of it is really the kind of infrastructure we should be producing.

For the water infrastructure portion alone, this amendment could create as many as 154,000 additional jobs beyond that which is estimated in the stimulus package. The transportation portion of the amendment would add 501,000 jobs. So, as Senator MURRAY said, in total, this amendment would create a net new 655,000 jobs—jobs that are desperately needed to put Americans back to work and revive our country.

I come from a State that is big. It is the seventh or eighth largest economy in the world. It has stopped all public works projects, and it is furloughing State employees. It is in deep trouble. Where California goes, because it is such a big part of the economic infrastructure of this Nation, affects other States as well.

I want to expand a bit as chairman of the Interior and Environment Subcommittee of Appropriations because I am very concerned about what I believe has been insufficient funding for clean water and sewer projects. We put over 50 percent of our allocation into these projects. It wasn't enough. We have a huge water infrastructure problem in America. Our sewer systems are deteriorating; they are old and they are broken. Each year, aging and overburdened sewer and storm water systems overflow; they break and release more than 860 billion gallons of partially treated sewage into our rivers and streams, polluting them. Last year, contamination from these spills and overflows was the second leading cause of beach closings and water health advisories nationwide—more than 4,000 closings and advisories—and the problem is only getting worse.

Investment in our Nation's water systems has not kept pace with the population growth or sprawling development.

The Government Accountability Office and EPA report that the Nation faces a \$300 billion to \$500 billion water and wastewater funding gap over the next 20 years. So by investing now in needed water and wastewater infrastructure, we can, in fact, create millions of jobs here at home and better protect human health.

With this amendment, the total for the water and wastewater State revolving fund will be \$13 billion, with \$10 billion for wastewater projects and \$3 billion for drinking water projects. As I

said, the EPA, which oversees this Federal program, has indicated to us that they can move these additional dollars quickly. These funds will go directly to the States, which in turn make them available to local communities. Because the law is a revolving loan fund, there is language in this that effectively makes these loans grants to States. The \$6 billion currently in the bill will fund 1,290 wastewater projects and 769 drinking water projects. By increasing this funding by \$7 billion, for the total of \$13 billion, this amendment would triple the number of wastewater projects to 3,226 and provide 30 percent more drinking water projects.

The States will choose these projects based on their most urgent needs. Here are some of the projects that have been funded in the past through this program:

The aquifer in Rockland County, NY, was being polluted by sewer waste from septic tanks. The local sewer district used \$80 million from the Clean Water State Revolving Fund to replace these septic systems with a new collection system and wastewater treatment plant. The county also installed advanced treatment technology to protect the millions of residents downstream of its facility.

The town of Easton, MD, was flushing huge nutrient loads into the Chesapeake Bay. It received a \$20.5 million loan to expand its wastewater system to install enhanced nutrient-removal technologies and now exceeds Chesapeake Bay's water quality goals.

A subdivision with septic systems in Lexington County, SC, needed a connection to the nearest town's public sewer. The area septic systems had been improperly maintained and were in jeopardy of contaminating the groundwater. Thanks to funding from this program, it has a connection.

In my State, Orange County is using \$162.9 million to implement a ground water replenishment system, the largest of its kind in the world. Highly treated wastewater will be pumped into basins, where it will percolate back into the ground. This project not only improves water quality but reliability and supply in an area facing long-term drought.

This amendment, as I said, waives the State match requirement in an effort to maximize the use of the funds. This funding, which can be put to use immediately, will assist the municipalities of our Nation in upgrading their wastewater systems and ending the damage to our environment. But it is not only these benefits that speak to the merits of increasing this funding—and we could do more; we could do at least another \$3 billion more under EPA's ability to move the money.

The U.S. Conference of Mayors estimates that every dollar spent on wastewater infrastructure generates a return of \$3 to \$7 that flows back directly into the economy. The Commerce Department estimates that for each additional job created in the

water and sewer industry, 3.68 jobs are created in all industries. So it has a ripple effect.

The Association of State and Interstate Water Pollution Control Administrators indicates that nearly \$20 billion of shovel-ready wastewater infrastructure projects await financing today throughout the country.

In conclusion, Mr. President, the problem I have with this package is that, in my view, it is heavy on tax cuts which go right to the bottom line of the deficit and the debt and will reduce allocations to appropriators to fund the next 2 years' budgets, unless we drive this country deeper into debt and deficit. It is shy on the infrastructure, which is the stimulus projects.

Let me make one other point on the change of America's buying habits which I believe has taken place. If you look at people actually laid off from Caterpillar and you look at retail closures—the latest of which is Macy's, as of last night, indicating that they are terminating 7,000 people from their jobs—you will see that people are buying less. It is reflected in automobile sales, it is reflected in tractor sales, and it is reflected in shopping and electronic equipment shopping.

I believe the important thing of this package is to put people back to work. My State has 1.7 million people who are out of work. We need to do those things that are necessary, such as extend unemployment insurance, protect the safety net, and have a massive program to rebuild what is a failing economic infrastructure in this country, so that America can compete in this new millennium.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to add as cosponsors Senators SCHUMER and BYRD.

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

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I thank Senator FEINSTEIN for her cosponsorship and working with me and the chairman on including this amendment that would provide 655,000 jobs.

I heard the Senator from Iowa earlier talking about providing or increasing Government jobs. I would let our colleagues know that this amendment before us is about private construction jobs.

In fact, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from AGC of America, Associated General Contractors, as well as a letter from FasterBetterSafer, Americans for Transportation Mobility, which represents the American Public Transportation Association, the American Road and Transportation Builders Association, the Associated Equipment Distributors, the Association of Equipment Manufacturers, the Associated General Contractors, the American Society of Civil Engineers, the International Union of Operating Engineers, the Laborers International Union of

North America, the National Asphalt Pavement Association, the National Stone, Sand, and Gravel Association, the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, in support of this amendment.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ASSOCIATED GENERAL CONTRACTORS OF AMERICA,
Arlington, VA, February 2, 2009.

Re: Support Murray/Feinstein Amendment.
Hon. HARRY REID,
U.S. Senate, Hart Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR REID: The Associated General Contractors of America urges you to support the Murray/Feinstein amendment to the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009. The amendment will provide additional funding to critical surface transportation and water infrastructure projects across the country.

Construction employment has tumbled by 899,000, or 11.6 percent, since peaking in September, 2006. Unfortunately because of dwindling public and private funding more than a million more good workers could face layoffs in 2009 without significant construction stimulus.

Providing a significant investment in funding for construction projects would help address our nation's infrastructure investment gap and create good jobs in communities across America. AGC estimates that, an additional \$1 billion of investment in nonresidential construction supports or creates 28,500 jobs. More than half of the gain would impact non construction elements of our economy, as workers and owners in the construction and supplier industries spend their added income on a wide range of goods and services.

We estimate that the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act would create or support more than 1.85 million new jobs between now and the end of 2010, including over 620,000 construction jobs, 300,000 jobs in supplying industries and 930,000 jobs throughout the broader economy.

The construction industry stands ready to participate in the economic recovery spawned by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009. Thousands of AGC members across the country have expressed their personal commitment to putting this funding to use quickly. Please support the Murray/Feinstein amendment.

Sincerely,

JEFFREY D. SHOAF,
Senior Executive Director,
Government and Public Affairs.

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 2, 2009.

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE U.S. SENATE: The Americans for Transportation Mobility (ATM) Coalition strongly supports the inclusion of funding for highways and public transportation in S. 336, the "American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009," and urges the Senate to increase funding levels for highways and public transportation to at least the levels provided in H.R. 1, the House-passed version of this legislation.

Preserving and creating jobs through highway and public transportation infrastructure investment is a key element of this economic recovery package. The investments in near-term transportation projects supported by this legislation would protect and create jobs to support broad recovery and address particularly hard hit sectors like construction. Transportation spending also results in

long-term economic benefits: transportation infrastructure plays a critical role supporting the nation's economy by facilitating safe, efficient, and reliable movement of people and goods.

The recovery package is an important step toward renewing highway and transit infrastructure, but it is only a beginning. The ATM Coalition looks forward to working with the Senate in the coming months on reauthorization of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act—A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), which must build on the investment in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act by providing the policy and programmatic reforms as well as long-term funding needed for highways and public transportation.

ATM urges you to increase funding for highways and public transportation investments in S. 336 to at least the House-passed levels.

Sincerely,

AMERICANS FOR TRANSPORTATION MOBILITY.

ATM Management Committee Members: American Public Transportation Association, American Road and Transportation Builders Association, Associated Equipment Distributors, Association of Equipment Manufacturers, Associated General Contractors, American Society of Civil Engineers, International Union of Operating Engineers, Laborers International Union of North America, National Asphalt Pavement Association, National Stone, Sand, and Gravel Association, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, the point is these are private sector jobs. In fact, less than 1 percent of these will go to Government jobs, and those jobs will be oversight and accountability to make sure our taxpayer dollars are spent wisely.

I look forward to having a vote on this amendment as soon as our chairman determines the time. I ask our Senate colleagues to join us in making sure we create the kind of investment, infrastructure, job creation that we have told America about, and we know will get us back on our feet.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I applaud the Senator from Washington in bringing this point to the attention of the American people, as I have been trying to do, that in this stimulus bill—and the same is true on the House side—there is far too little construction, far too little jobs.

I found it very difficult to believe that in the bill that came over from the other side there was only some \$30 billion. I can share now, because it has been public, that 8 days ago on Monday, President Obama addressed our conference. During that conference, we talked about the stimulus bill. He was very generous with his time. In fact, he was there for an entire hour. I said: It is inconceivable to me—and here we were talking about the bill that was being considered on the other side—that with some \$800 billion or \$900 billion—that is without interest—it is going to be over \$1 trillion when you add interest—but with those amounts, you only have \$30 billion of roads and highways.

Quite frankly, President Obama was not sure my statement was accurate, and he asked Larry Summers, who was in the meeting. We were all a little bit confused about that, except I wasn't because very specifically it said \$30 billion on roads and highways.

To be fair, there is another \$19 billion in water projects. Infrastructure was a little higher than that. My concern is roads and highways.

The reason I am concerned is that we went through the 2005 Transportation reauthorization bill. At that time, Republicans were in the majority, so I was taking the lead on passage of that bill. I had the support of the ranking member at that time, who was Senator BOXER from California. We worked closely together on that bill. We actually were increasing all we could as time went by because the idea of funding infrastructure and funding roads and highways has a history to it.

When I was first elected, every year we had huge surpluses in the highway trust fund. That is probably the most popular tax out there. With the highway trust fund, people know or they believe that money is going to be used to increase capacity and increase the condition, the repairs, the maintenance of the transportation system we have now.

Senator BOXER and I worked together on that bill to do all we could to enhance it, to raise the amounts because even as large as that bill was, that did not even maintain what we have today.

Over the years, as people saw the surpluses in the highway trust fund, their tendency, as is always the tendency around this place, was let's grab it and put it into something else. We started having hiking trails, we started having other elements of transportation, over and above roads and highways, bridges and maintenance. Those are the things that originally the highway trust fund, way back in the early fifties, was there for. That is what was established back in the Eisenhower administration.

We have gone over the years, and this took a turnaround a few years ago with so many people loading on to the highway trust fund and less and less was used for maintenance and expansion of our highway system. We got into the position where in 1998, during the Clinton administration, he witnessed the very large surplus that was in the highway trust fund. He took it and put it into the general fund. The total amount was \$9 billion. That was something to which I was very much opposed because I thought of that as a moral issue. The people of this country were led to believe that if they paid for gas at the pump, that money was going to enhance our highway system. That used to be the situation. Anyway, we were able to successfully remove that and bring that back into the highway trust fund a matter of a few weeks ago. We improved that a little bit. Still, we have a deficit that cannot do the job the American people expect.

I am considered by some of the rating organizations to be one of the most

conservative Members of the Senate. Yet I am a big spender in some areas—national defense, infrastructure. That is what we are supposed to be doing, and we have these opportunities to do it.

As I said, I applaud the Senator from Washington for recognizing the need to increase the amount of money for roads and highways.

During the reauthorization bill of 2005, we talked about what our needs were. We happen to have a guy in the State of Oklahoma, a guy named Gary Ridley, the best highway director anywhere in the United States. What he has done is put together what do we have in the State of Oklahoma that is spade-ready to employ people tomorrow if we are able to have enough money to take care of some of the things that are already authorized; we don't have to go through the environmental impact statements and other statements. This is all ready to go.

For that reason, I thought if this job stimulus bill is going to do something to stimulate the economy, it is going to have to hire people. To hire people, you are going to have to get a much larger percentage.

Getting back to 8 days ago when President Obama was before the Republicans, at that time I said: If I am right and you are wrong in terms of the fact that you only have 3.5 percent of the total amount of money that will go to roads and highways, would you be willing to raise that to some 10 percent? I am not sure the answer was very clear, but nonetheless, it is something that is very reasonable to make as a request.

I have one problem with the Murray bill. First, I agree that we need to have a larger percentage of the money going into roads and highways. But I think we also need a little bit of truth in advertising. If we are going to call this package a stimulus bill, then we need to direct the resources to the programs that have demonstrated the ability to create jobs immediately. However, merely adding the total number, as this amendment does, without giving priority to programs that are truly stimulative is perhaps not all that responsible.

In addition, the major problem I have is that the stimulus needs to be offset. You cannot tell me, if we are looking at \$900 billion out there, we cannot find something to offset in order to take care of the immediate problems we have in this country in terms of our infrastructure.

I do not see the Senator from Washington on the floor now, but I would ask her—and I asked her a few minutes ago—if she was willing to offset this money. I believe her response was not at the present time. So if it changes as this develops, then perhaps I will change.

I will say this: If you are not going to be able to offset this amount, then I certainly would oppose this amendment. There will be lots of opportunities to increase the infrastructure in-

vestment over the next few days that do not add to the size of the bill. We cannot add to the size of this bill.

To me, the whole idea—well, the amount is inconceivable to most people, most thinking people, in America, and it cannot be increased.

We have numerous opportunities. We have the Boxer-Bond amendment to increase highway investment by \$5.5 billion. It is fully offset. I strongly support Senator BOXER and Senator BOND in this effort. The program they eliminate is a discretionary program that would not even select projects for an entire year.

Then the program provides an additional 3 years to finish the project. That makes sense to me. My chairman, Senator BOXER, and I as the ranking member of Environment and Public Works Committee, go along with a bipartisan group of colleagues who will have a second amendment to add \$50 billion to highway transit and clean drinking water. This amendment would take funds not obligated within a year up to \$50 billion from programs in the stimulus that are not spending and redirect them to infrastructure projects that are ready to have a contract awarded within 120 days after receiving the funding. That is what we call a stimulus. That puts people to work in jobs. And it doesn't add to the cost of the bill.

Those are two opportunities coming up; we will have to get this done. It also moves the money from programs that are not stimulating the economy, which I think is a good idea.

I at this time urge my colleagues to oppose the Murray amendment even though I agree with what she is trying to do. I want to have this offset. We have these two opportunities that I mentioned coming up where we will have the opportunity to accomplish the same objective and have them offset.

Frankly, the amount she is talking about is not as much as I would like. I would like it to be an additional \$50 billion which we will be talking about in another amendment coming up.

Since it is not going to be offset, I make a point of order against the Murray amendment's emergency spending designation under 204(a)5A of S. Con. Res. 21 of the 110th Congress.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator INOUYE be able to make a UC and then I be granted the floor to speak in favor of the Murray amendment and for the waiver she will need.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Hawaii is recognized.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 12:20 p.m. today, the Senate proceed to vote in relation to the Murray-Feinstein-Specter and others amendment No. 110 and that

time until then be equally divided and controlled in the usual form; that if a budget point of order is raised against the amendment, that a motion to waive the relevant point of order be considered as made; and that no amendments be in order to the amendment prior to a vote in relation thereto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. THUNE. Reserving the right to object, can I clarify exactly then what the UC is? The Senator from Hawaii would have an opportunity to respond and offer a unanimous consent request, and then the Senator from California would have how much time?

Mrs. BOXER. I have not asked for a specific time. I would take 15 minutes.

Mr. THUNE. I was hoping I would have an opportunity to make some remarks before the vote. The vote is going to occur at 12:20. Very good.

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

The Senator from California is recognized.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I rise as the chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee in favor of the Murray-Feinstein amendment, and I hope we will vote to waive this budget point of order. I want to tell you why.

Senator INHOFE is correct that I will be working with him very proudly on a couple of amendments which will all be offset. But in general, we are in such a crisis in this country that we need to look at three things in this package: jobs, jobs, jobs. This package falls short. Once we get to the conference, I think some things will fall away. I do. But we need to boost the spending, it seems to me, on the most efficient programs that create jobs, and not just any type of job but good jobs—jobs in the construction industry where we have seen devastation hit our families.

In my State of California, we have a 9.2-percent unemployment rate. Let me reiterate. In my State of California, we have a 9.2-percent unemployment rate. Were it not for our environmental laws which are putting people to work, putting solar rooftops on and the rest, I hate to think of where we would be because housing construction has literally stopped in its tracks.

The importance of the Murray-Feinstein amendment is this: jobs, jobs, jobs. That is what the people want us to invest in. We know very well that when we invest money in the type of infrastructure we are talking about—highways, water systems, sewer systems—the jobs come along with it.

We also know a lot of our physical infrastructure is failing. We can never get out of our minds the tragic collapse of the bridge in Minnesota. And when we look at the condition of our bridges across this great Nation of ours, we find there are way too many—maybe a quarter of them—in need of repair. So when we talk about this amendment, we are talking about adding funding

for roads, for bridges, for transit, for rail, for ports, for drinking and wastewater infrastructure, which are the most efficient job creators.

I think it is fair to ask, are our States and localities ready to spend these dollars or will they go there only to sit? The answer is, our States are more than ready. According to the U.S. Department of Transportation, the backlog of needed improvements to simply maintain the current bridge and highway network is \$495 billion. That is the backlog. This amendment is \$25 billion, and as I understand it, that is being added to \$27 billion. So we are at least adding more funding that is real.

To me, it is not enough. That is why Senator INHOFE and I are going to have an amendment that says if the rest of the funds in this bill are not committed by a time certain, we are going to put up to \$50 billion more into these accounts. I hope that passes, but this is a very important amendment. I hope we will pass it on a bipartisan vote, but the first step is to allow the budget act to be waived.

The Department of Transportation also told us something else. They said that for every \$1 billion invested in highways and bridges at the Federal level—and if that funding is matched—we could create and maintain 34,800 jobs. That is 34,800 jobs for \$1 billion invested at the Federal level. I want to sort of shake my friends, in a nice way, and remind them that a million jobs were lost in this great Nation in the last couple of months—a half million in December and a half million in January. By the way, a half million also in November. I want you to think about your States and how many families that is. The number of jobs that have been lost is bigger than some States—bigger than some States. Close your eyes and imagine the whole State of Delaware with every person unemployed. That is what has happened so far, and worse.

We need to get ahead of ourselves here. What worries me about the Senate is that we are kind of chasing after this tiger called recession. It took the Bush administration forever to call it a recession. Then they finally called it a recession and said, well, hopefully, we will get over it quickly. But we keep chasing it, trying to grab it by the tail. We have to get in front of this recession or it will become a depression. You get in front of it by doing the things you know will create jobs.

Now, is every single item in this bill something I support? No. But I support the infrastructure part. I support the help to the energy sector so we can get off foreign oil, I support building a smart grid, I support making sure people who are long-term unemployed get the chance to feed their families, and I support doing more about housing. But I surely know this, as chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee, a dollar invested in the physical infrastructure, in rebuilding it, is a dollar that will create jobs—thou-

sands and thousands and thousands of jobs. This amendment is a good amendment. It doesn't overreach. It under-reaches. But it is a start.

The next question might be: Well, Senator, I agree with you that this investment will create jobs, but have the States identified projects that will qualify? The State departments of transportation, according to the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, have identified over 5,000 projects of over \$64 billion in value which could create nearly 1.8 million jobs. We could restore the jobs that have been lost in the last 2 months with this amendment. Our committee, the Committee on Environment and Public Works—and I have my good staff here—has surveyed many of these States and we have determined these projects are shovel ready.

So let me say it again: \$64 billion of shovel-ready projects, ready to go—1.8 million jobs. And the underlying bill falls short. The underlying bill falls short. If we pass the Murray-Feinstein-Boxer, et cetera, amendment, we will in fact move toward equaling that shovel-ready number we have.

The American Public Transportation Association tells us that States have identified 787 ready-to-go public transit projects totaling \$15.9 billion that would sustain thousands of jobs. The U.S. Conference of Mayors tells us there is a total of 15,000 ready-to-go infrastructure projects in 641 cities. So you have the States telling us they are ready, you have the transit districts saying they are ready, and you have the U.S. Conference of Mayors saying they are ready. And when I look at the underlying bill, I believe it didn't fund these projects to the tune they should have.

This amendment also increases investments in drinking water and wastewater infrastructure. We are so far behind on those programs. If our kids can't drink the water, that is trouble. We need to make sure the drinking water is safe. If we have a sewer spill, that is a disaster. We need to get out ahead of that. A recent EPA study—and, Mr. President, you will be interested in this—found that failure to increase investment in water and wastewater infrastructure could result in a \$500 billion water infrastructure gap in the next 20 years. That EPA study was done under George Bush. Okay, George Bush's EPA told us we could have an infrastructure gap of \$500 billion in the next 20 years. So let's invest in water infrastructure. It will replace aging water pipes, expand treatment facilities, reduce pollution flowing into our Nation's rivers and streams and allow for implementation of projects to improve water efficiency.

The Murray-Feinstein amendment, my friends, is critical. We don't do enough in the underlying bill. And for those who worry about an offset, we will find those in conference. We are going to keep this bill where President Obama wants it. We know that. But

let's walk down the bipartisan lane on this one. We all know our States and our localities are crying out. We all know our people are hurting because they are not working. With this amendment, we create jobs in areas that we have to pay attention to anyway. Are we going to wait for our sewers to overflow into the streets? Are we going to wait for more bridges to collapse? I say that is ridiculous. You can't be a great economy when bridges are collapsing all around you, and our bridges are in trouble.

So to say you won't vote for this amendment because it is \$25 billion in an \$800-plus billion, almost \$900-plus billion bill, is shortsighted. I commit to working with my friends on the other side to find the offsets in this bill. It is not going to be that hard. I agree with Senator INHOFE, they are not in this bill, but we can work to get some offsets in the conference.

Local people are saying to us, please, Senators, do something to help us get out there, spend the money on these shovel-ready projects—the highways, the bridges, the transit systems, the sewer systems, the safe drinking water issues. Help us do it. We can make this a far better bill. Private industry wants this, and these are private sector jobs. These are contracts that will be let for local contractors, small business, big business, union members, and nonunion members. This is what we should be doing in this bill.

I signed a letter with Chairman BAUCUS on this very topic and, guess what, Senator INHOFE signed it, Senator BOND signed it, and we said we need to do more building of the infrastructure of our great country. The unemployment rate for construction workers is double the national unemployment rate. Listen to this: The unemployment rate for construction workers is 15.3 percent—15.3 percent in December—compared to a 7.1-percent national unemployment. There are plenty of workers available. They are ready and they are excited to get to work. They have to support their families. They are suffering, they are worried, and they do not want to be on the Federal dole. They do not want to get food stamps. They do not want it. They want to work. They want to work.

This is an important test of whether the Senate has a heart, frankly, and a brain, because I think this is where your brain and your heart come together with a yes vote. Because with our heart we know people are suffering. With our heart we know construction workers are suffering. With our brain we know that when they go to work and they pay taxes, we all benefit. With our brain we know when we rebuild the physical infrastructure our country is stronger and we set the predicate for a very strong economic recovery into the future.

So I feel very strongly, as I am sure you can tell from the sound of my voice. I just hope we don't have a partisan vote. I think this is one where we

should come together. We will find new offsets. President Obama is going to have a cap. He is going to say we don't want to spend more than X. We will make this work, but let's have a good vote on this motion to waive the budget act. I think our country will be better for it, and the people out there who are watching this debate will feel good that we know our construction workers are suffering and our construction companies are suffering, and this would go a long way to boost their confidence.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from South Dakota wants to speak for 15 minutes. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Michigan, notwithstanding the pending unanimous consent request, be allowed to speak for 5 minutes following Senator THUNE of South Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from South Dakota is recognized.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, this is a very important debate for the American people. We have an economy that is struggling, we have a lot of people who are hurting, and I think in the context of that debate, it is very important that we remember these dollars we are spending are the American people's dollars. Yes, we want to be able to respond to the economic crisis the country is experiencing in a way that allows people to spend more money, that gets more money back into the hands of the American people, that will help grow the economy and create jobs, and provide the necessary incentives for small businesses to invest, but I think it is important at the outset of the debate that we give serious consideration and thought to what we are doing here and what we are talking about in terms of the dimensions and the scale of what we are talking about.

When we throw around numbers here in Washington, DC, when we talk in millions and we talk in billions, and in this case a trillion dollars, we treat it as if it is something abstract. I think it is sometimes important to boil it down so that we put in perspective the dimension, the scale, the scope, and the size of what is being talked about this week on the floor of the Senate.

I want to put up a chart that illustrates that very point. Imagine thinking about a trillion dollars, and putting it back to back or if you put a bunch of hundred dollar bills back to back on top of each other and asking people around the country how high that stack would go.

I am sure you would get a lot of varying answers. You would probably have some people say it might go 300 yards into the air. Some people might say: Well, it might go 5 miles into the air.

But the reality is, if you took hundred-dollar bills and stacked them on top of each other, you would have a stack that goes 689 miles high, back to back. That is hundred-dollar bills. We are not talking about dollar bills, we are talking about hundred-dollar bills.

Mrs. BOXER. Will the Senator yield for a question on this point?

Mr. THUNE. I would say to the Senator, through the Chair, the Senator from California just had an opportunity. I would like to finish my remarks. Then I would be happy to yield.

Mrs. BOXER. Thank you. I will stay on the floor.

Mr. THUNE. The point I am making is, you have to sometimes illustrate this in a sometimes very graphic way to help us understand what we are talking about. So I would make my point simply again: Hundred-dollar bills stacked back to back to back, if you stacked them on top of each other, would equal 689 miles.

Now, another way of looking at this is, if you took hundred-dollar bills and wrapped them around the Earth at the Equator, in other words, you took hundred-dollar bills, not stack them on top of each other but wrap them side by side all the way around the Earth, if you can believe this, it would go around the Earth almost 39 times. That is 969,000 miles of hundred-dollar bills that would go around the Earth if you took a trillion dollars and broke it down that way.

That very simply puts into perspective what it is we are talking about. Someone else has described it this way: If you started spending a million dollars a day on the day Christ was born, and you spent a million dollars every single day up until today, you still would not have spent a trillion. That is the dimension of what we are talking about.

I remember when I was in business school, we had our little business analyst calculators that we used to do financial calculations. You could not even get to this. You could not even get to a trillion dollars on calculators back at that time. I hope, today, for purposes of doing economic calculations, because of the scale we are talking about, these calculators go that far.

But my point is, this is an enormous amount of money, an enormous amount of money. We are talking about \$1.26 trillion of our children's and grandchildren's money over the next 10 years. I think there is a basic principle that all Members of the Senate should consider when we are spending our fellow citizens' hard-earned dollars. That principle is this: We should not spend money we do not have on things we do not need. Let me say that again. We should not spend money we do not have on things we do not need.

Families and business owners understand this principle. Unfortunately, it is a principle that has been lost and es-

aped our colleagues on the other side who have drafted this 700-page, trillion-dollar spending bill, which is filled with lots of Government spending that I think most Americans would characterize as wasteful. I am not saying all Government spending is bad. Government spending, if it is properly focused and highly scrutinized, may have some countercyclical impact. One example of that would be infrastructure spending that we use to improve our roads and bridges and provide access to clean drinking water, that can provide jobs in the short term, and can create economic opportunity in the long term.

The problem we have is this bill is laden with unfocused, unnecessary, and wasteful spending. Now, the stated goal of a stimulus proposal, as stated by, I think, Larry Summers earlier this year, was it should be timely, temporary, and targeted. I may not be saying these in the right order but basically timely, temporary, and targeted, basically three criteria, three metrics by which we would measure a stimulus proposal and whether it is effective and whether it works.

I would argue this particular bill is none of the above. It is slow, it is unfocused, and it is unending. It makes commitments way beyond the 1-year, 2-year window that we are talking about if we want to have an impact and create jobs with stimulus.

So even with a price tag that is greater than any previous stimulus package in the history of our country, the majority of the spending in this bill is not focused on job creation and fails to meet the job creation goals our President called for and I think the American public expects.

With record deficits in the near term, this bill, as drafted, is a mistake that I do not believe we can afford to make. According to the Congressional Budget Office, we have a \$1.2 trillion deficit in fiscal year 2009, before any financial stabilization or stimulus measures are passed by this Congress.

Now, again, we are going to spend \$1 trillion. I would point out what \$1 trillion means. If you took hundred-dollar bills, you put them side by side, 969,000 miles, and that is the amount we are talking about spending. It is also the amount of the deficit in this particular fiscal year, fiscal year 2009. That is before, as I said before, any financial stabilization or stimulus measures are passed by this Congress. Frankly, we expect other requests to come forward in the area of financial stabilization.

To put the \$1.2 trillion deficit into perspective, that is roughly triple the previous record of \$455 billion that the deficit came to in fiscal year 2008. So it is important to note that already this deficit in fiscal year 2009 will exceed by almost three times the deficit in the year 2008. It is going to be over \$1 trillion before we do any of these other things.

It is also important to note that the Congress, not the executive branch, has the constitutional authority to raise

and to spend revenue; that is, the power of the purse, by our Constitution, falls to Congress. So if we are looking for a scapegoat in this whole fiscal imbalance, we need to look no further than the Halls of Congress.

In fact, in the last couple years—the Democrats regained the Congress back in 2007, the Federal deficit has ballooned from \$160 billion or 1.2 percent of our gross domestic product in 2007 to over \$1 trillion or 8.3 percent of our gross domestic product this year, in fiscal year 2009.

Now, if we include just the additional spending for this proposal before us, the 2009 projected deficit, I am talking about now stimulus and the deficit as I mentioned earlier that is already projected for 2009, it would increase to \$1.43 trillion, almost \$1.5 trillion, in deficits or, put another way, about 10 percent of our gross domestic product.

I have to remind my colleagues that we are still very early in the year. We have almost 9 months left in this fiscal year to spend even more of our children's and grandchildren's tax dollars. The Congress is soon going to consider an omnibus spending bill for the remainder of 2009.

We also will have to consider a war supplemental bill and the potential of additional bailouts for the financial sector and we are told that request may be coming as early as next week.

Without a question, we are going to end 2009 in perhaps the worst financial condition the Nation has ever seen. In fact, the last time we had a single-year deficit that the GDP ratio was over 8 percent was the year 1945, during the height of World War II.

Now, for comparative purposes, the European Union, the Federal deficit there that we have this year of 10 percent, if you add the stimulus in, would not even be good enough to get into the European Union. According to European Union rules, member nations have to have a budget deficit of 3 percent or less. Our Federal deficit this year will be three times higher than the maximum threshold to get into the European Union.

Of course, European countries are also dealing with the same contractionary forces that we are dealing with in this country, which are driving up their collective deficit to GDP ratios to record highs. But even with those factors and influences in those economies, the Euro zone's collected deficits will only reach 4.7 percent in 2009. That is 4.7 percent of their gross domestic product, which will be less than half the U.S. total.

When you talk about being faced with such unsustainable deficits, Congress, I would argue, has to carefully analyze any and all deficit spending. Any additional Government programs that are financed with more deficit spending need to meet the highest standards of job creation and return on taxpayer investment.

Unfortunately, the spending bill we have before us contains a long list of

Government programs that fail to meet that standard. I can start to go down the list—I will not go through the entire list because it would take too long—\$1 billion for the Census; \$20 billion for the removal of small- to medium-sized fish passage barriers; \$400 million for STD prevention; \$25 million to rehabilitate ATV or recreational vehicle trails; \$34 million to remodel the Department of Commerce headquarters in Washington, DC; \$70 million to support supercomputer activities for climate research; \$208 million for disconnected youth; \$1.2 billion for summer employment; \$246 million in tax breaks for Hollywood filmmakers; \$6 billion so bureaucrats in Washington can enjoy the benefits of green technology.

I happen to be one who supports green technology. I think we ought to be moving in that direction. But we also have many opportunities, energy bills we have made on a regular basis around here, in order to engage in how we invest to be moving our country in a green direction.

These programs do not create jobs. They hardly justify a \$1.2 trillion debt on the shoulders of our children and grandchildren.

So I would encourage my colleagues, as we go through the debate this week to scrutinize every line item in this 700-page bill and ask themselves if these provisions will create jobs and justify making record deficits even worse. We should not spend money we do not have on things we do not need.

Over the next few days, several amendments are going to be offered to strike or replace wasteful spending items in this bill. I would call on my colleagues to consider these amendments with an open mind and a clear understanding of the dangerous consequences of a trillion-dollar mistake. A trillion dollars is a terrible thing to waste.

What we are talking about, as I mentioned in terms of the dimensions of this, if you look at hundred-dollar bills side by side, 38.9 times it goes around the Earth at the Equator. That is what I am talking about.

Mrs. BOXER. Would the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized.

Mrs. BOXER. I am astounded by this new-found fiscal responsibility I hear from the other side of the aisle. I wish to ask my friend a question: Do you know what the debt was when Bill Clinton left office and George Bush took over and there was a Republican Congress? Do you know what it was at that time?

Mr. THUNE. I would say I am not sure I know the answer, but I am sure I am going to hear it.

Mrs. BOXER. The debt was \$5.7 trillion when George Bush and the Republicans took over. I will say to my friend, not to ask him a question, the debt today is \$10.1 trillion; a doubling of the debt was brought to you courtesy of the Republicans.

Does my friend know—I am sure he does—that when Bill Clinton left office, we had a surplus in our budget. We not only did not have a deficit, we had a surplus. My friend knows what George Bush left us with—hundreds of billions of dollars, hundreds of billions of dollars of debt.

So for him to stand up now that the people are suffering and struggling and they need jobs and become the Herbert Hoover of current day times, I think it is hurtful to the American people. I say to my friend: Why is it that my friend now is suddenly talking about debt and did not discuss it when the Republicans were in charge?

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from California for her question. I think we can all talk about what has come before, what has happened in the past. Frankly, there are lots of reasons why we are in the situation we are in.

But I would remind my colleague from California that the President of the United States does not appropriate a single penny; that is done by the Congress. That is done by the Congress. We in the Congress have created this problem. Now, arguably it has happened under Republican Congresses, it has happened under Democratic Congresses. But the point is, we are here talking about spending an additional trillion dollars on the top of a historic amount of debt that we have in the country and deficits that this year are going to be \$1.2 trillion. That is without adding in the stimulus. That is without talking about the financial stabilization request that is going to come later. That is without the omnibus spending bill, which is for the first time, I might add, going to be over \$1 trillion, and that is without the supplemental bill that will be coming our way later this year.

This Congress is talking about going on a spending spree that is unprecedented in American history. Yes, we can all point to the mistakes that were made in the past, but I am here to talk about today my concern for the future and what we are doing in the future, to future generations and our children and grandchildren, when we impose this kind of burden on them.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, may I have 60 seconds?

Mrs. MURRAY. May I ask how much time is left on our side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 5 minutes allocated to the Senator from Michigan. That is all the remaining time.

Mrs. MURRAY. As the sponsor of the amendment, I ask unanimous consent for 30 seconds prior to the vote.

Mrs. BOXER. And I ask unanimous consent to extend that for 1½ minutes.

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

Mrs. BOXER. I want to take 60 seconds to respond to Senator THUNE. He says he doesn't want to point fingers. He is pointing fingers all over the place. He says we are here today talking about a trillion dollars. Let me tell

my colleagues what we are talking about: the deepest recession since the Great Depression, jobs being lost at 500,000 and 600,000 a month. All of a sudden some of our Republican friends have said: Whoops. Now that we can't give tax breaks to the people who are earning over a million and now that the Iraq war is winding down, we are not that interested in spending money.

Democrats, when we were in control, had our priorities straight. We said: Put families first. We balanced the budget, and we will do it again. But we must restore this economy. When I use the phrase "Herbert Hoover," which has become kind of a symbol for doing nothing in the face of the middle class crumbling, I know what I am saying. I hope we will vote for the Murray amendment. It will create thousands of jobs.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. STABENOW. Mr. President, I commend Senator MURRAY for her amendment. I am proud to be a cosponsor, and I strongly support the motion to waive the Budget Act. When my friend from South Dakota said we should not spend money on things we don't need, we need jobs. We need jobs, and that is exactly what this amendment does. The additional resources in this amendment of \$25 billion, according to the normal formulas used, by my calculation would create over 1,187,500 new, good-paying jobs. That is exactly what we need to do to get this economy going again. With all due respect to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, the reality is, we have had 8 years of their philosophy, 8 years of a philosophy focused on the supply side of supply and demand. Start at the top, it will trickle down. What has that gotten us? In the last year alone, what that has meant to us is 2,956,000 good-paying American jobs gone, in 1 year. Over the last 8 years in manufacturing, which is the backbone of the middle class, we have lost over 4.1 million manufacturing jobs.

What this amendment is about, what this recovery plan is about, is changing the way we do business, changing priorities, focusing on middle-class workers, communities, folks working hard to stay in the middle class or get into the middle class, the people who need money in their pocket to buy things so we can have a strong economy again. We are talking about, in this proposal, creating jobs. That is what this is about.

The philosophy that has been operating for the last 8 years has put us in a situation where we lost more jobs last year than any other time since 1945: Eleven million people are out of work. Something has to change.

I commend our committee chairmen for their leadership, Senators BAUCUS and INOUYE, and all of the good work that has gone into changing direction.

The reality is, we are at a point in time where we have to focus on the

folks who want a job, who want to go to work in the morning, to be able to pay the bills and keep the mortgage and put the kids in college and put food on the table. That is what this amendment does. This is about rebuilding America. At the end of it, we as taxpayers get something for it. We know a quarter of our bridges are in dangerous condition. We know we need to focus on roads and bridges and water and sewer systems, building 21st century schools for children, more focus on public transportation. We need to focus on creating good-paying jobs. That is what this amendment is all about. We have had enough of policies that only focused on a few. We have had enough of policies that asked the majority of Americans to sit and wait for something to trickle down to them and their families. This recovery plan rejects a philosophy that has not worked. Frankly, it is a philosophy that was rejected last November. People are saying they want to change the focus.

What have we done? We have put together a recovery plan that focuses on jobs and rebuilding America. That is what the Murray amendment does. We focus on green manufacturing and green technologies, which are so important to our future, because as manufacturing was the backbone of the middle class for the last century, a green economy will build on manufacturing, will build on the middle class of the future. We have significant investments that move us in that direction, that not only make sure we are growing fuels and that we are operating in a more efficient manner, but that we are building the green technologies here so the jobs are here. That is what this is about. I believe strongly that we need to waive the Budget Act. We need to get on with the Murray amendment, because the bottom line of all of this is rebuilding the middle class.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, the amendment we have before us is of critical importance. By adopting this infrastructure amendment, we will improve this package by increasing its focus on repairing and upgrading our Nation's infrastructure. The fact is, our Nation's highways, bridges, and transit and water systems are just not keeping pace with our country's needs.

For our economy, our workers, and our future, we have to rebuild America. This amendment will instantly translate into construction projects in communities across our country and send a quick jolt through our economy.

In all, this amendment will create 655,000 new jobs. We cannot forget that unemployment in construction is higher than in any other sector.

We know transportation investments are one of the most effective ways to grow our economy. For every dollar we invest in transportation, we get an immediate \$1.59 in return.

But make no mistake—this amendment is not just a short-term fix. It is a long-term investment that will pay off for our entire Nation.

The truth is, as a Nation, we have neglected our pressing infrastructure needs. More than 25 percent of our Nation's bridges are deficient. Let us not forget the catastrophic bridge collapse in Minneapolis just a year and a half ago. Gridlock on our highways means each commuter spends an average of 38 hours a year sitting in traffic, burning 26 gallons of gas while going nowhere. And travelers in many parts of our country are stuck in their cars simply because they don't have the option to board a train. Our economy—the largest in the world—still doesn't have a world-class passenger rail system.

This amendment will allow States to invest in highways, bridges, transit systems and expanded rail service.

And it will put people back to work. Right now, families across our country are suffering. Every day more and more people join the unemployment line, a line that is right now 11 million people long.

We have a tremendous opportunity before us to rebuild our infrastructure, reinvigorate our economy, and create jobs.

We have a lot to do in the next week, and I hope we will meet our obligations and get the job done.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, this amendment directs \$25 billion to a targeted list of infrastructure programs, including highway, transit, and water and sewer programs. Adopting the amendment will make investments in our Nation's physical infrastructure a clear focal point in the economic recovery bill. And it will create 654,818 jobs.

We have shovel-ready projects in every jurisdiction in my home State of Maryland.

Let me take just a few minutes to explain how this amendment will benefit my State. It is a story that will be repeated across America.

Transportation:

The amendment calls for a \$2 billion increase in transit grants for local communities, which will be allocated by well-established formula. This provision alone would increase Maryland's share of transit funds by \$35.8 million.

Fixed guideway modernization funding will be increased by \$2 billion as well, resulting in an \$88 million boost for Maryland. Together these two transit provisions will provide nearly 3,000 jobs in Maryland.

The highway provisions in the bill will add \$13 billion to repairing and improving our network of roads. Maryland's share will be \$208 million, creating 5,580 jobs here in this state alone.

Water:

Drinking water: the amendment sends an additional \$13.8 million for drinking water projects to Maryland to upgrade our aging drinking water facilities.

Clean water: this amendment will send an additional \$146.4 million into Maryland. We have over a billion dollars in needs to repair and upgrade our sewer systems in Maryland. These additional funds will protect Marylanders

from the health effects associated with sewerage overflows. It will improve our water quality in rivers and streams across the State, including our national treasure, the Chesapeake Bay.

Together the water infrastructure funds total an additional \$160.2 million in Maryland that will create 6,270 jobs.

This is an amendment that meets our critical infrastructure needs and creates jobs right away, giving our economy the stimulus it needs.

But this is also an amendment that is temporary and targeted. We will get major infrastructure improvements that will last much longer than the funds themselves. These are investments roads, bridges, sewer systems, drinking water facilities—that typically last 30, 40 even 50 years. This is a smart investment in America's future.

I am proud to serve as an original co-sponsor of this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to give it their enthusiastic support. This is an amendment that is an investment in America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington, under a previous order, is recognized for 30 seconds.

Mrs. MURRAY. I ask unanimous consent that Senators CARPER and TESTER be added as cosponsors of the amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Pennsylvania be given 2 minutes prior to my closing remarks.

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

The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I believe we do need a stimulus package. I have not had an opportunity to speak on the bill generally but will do so later today to express concerns I have about not following regular order in having hearings. But I understand the President is concerned about very prompt action. I support this amendment for \$25 billion in infrastructure. I believe the bill is too heavily weighted on items which ought to be in the budget process, very important items, but not in the stimulus package, and more heavily directed to infrastructure on projects which are shovel ready. This amendment is directed to that objective. Governor Rendell has assured me and the public that he can have highway jobs ready in 6 months, shovel ready to proceed. So I believe this is what the stimulus ought to be doing.

I would have preferred to have seen an offset for this \$25 billion. There are funds where it could have been offset; for example, in the State Stabilization Program, \$79 billion, which is broad, wide-ranging discretion to the Governors, which ought not to be a part of the stimulus package. We will have an opportunity in the balance of this bill to find the savings of this \$25 billion. The overall bill ought to be less than the \$819 billion passed by the House. But for the present time, I will vote to waive the budget, looking for an opportunity to find the \$25 billion offset later and looking for other opportuni-

ties to have an effective stimulus which is not quite so expensive.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Pennsylvania. I urge my colleagues to approve this \$25 billion for the 655,000 jobs across the country to rebuild roads, bridges, sewers, and infrastructure. This amendment will put people to work, and it will get the country back to the point where we feel strong again. I have heard the arguments about offsets, and I know there are a number of Senators who are working to find agreement on how we can reduce the cost of the underlying bill. We will work with them. But let's make sure we understand that infrastructure is a priority and approve this amendment.

I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to waive the Budget Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) is necessarily absent.

Mr. KYL. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 58, nays 39, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 33 Leg.]

YEAS—58

Akaka	Feinstein	Nelson (FL)
Baucus	Gillibrand	Nelson (NE)
Bayh	Hagan	Pryor
Begich	Harkin	Reed
Bennet	Inouye	Reid
Bingaman	Johnson	Rockefeller
Bond	Kaufman	Sanders
Boxer	Kerry	Schumer
Brown	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Burris	Kohl	Specter
Byrd	Lautenberg	Stabenow
Cantwell	Leahy	Tester
Cardin	Levin	Udall (CO)
Carper	Lieberman	Udall (NM)
Casey	Lincoln	Warner
Conrad	McCaskill	Webb
Dodd	Menendez	Whitehouse
Dorgan	Merkley	
Durbin	Mikulski	Wyden
Feingold	Murphy	

NAYS—39

Alexander	DeMint	Martinez
Barrasso	Ensign	McCain
Bennett	Enzi	McConnell
Brownback	Graham	Murkowski
Bunning	Grassley	Risch
Burr	Hatch	Roberts
Chambliss	Hutchison	Sessions
Coburn	Inhofe	Shelby
Cochran	Isakson	Snowe
Collins	Johanns	Thune
Corker	Kyl	Vitter
Cornyn	Landrieu	Voinovich
Crapo	Lugar	Wicker

NOT VOTING—2

Gregg Kennedy

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 58, the nays are 39. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected and the emergency designation is stricken.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mrs. BOXER. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m. today.

Thereupon, at 12:55 p.m., the Senate recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. CARPER).

AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT OF 2009—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized.

(The remarks of Mr. NELSON of Florida pertaining to the submission of S. Con. Res. 4 are located in today's RECORD under "Submission of Concurrent and Senate Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks recognition?

The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 109 TO AMENDMENT NO. 98

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside, and I call up an amendment.

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

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. COBURN] proposes an amendment numbered 109.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

On page 475, beginning on line 1, strike through page 477, line 17.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, we are in the midst of debating a "stimulus bill" that has been brought forth in the hopes of alleviating some of the economic pain we have in this country.

Principally, I object to many of the provisions in the bill because they are not stimulatory whatsoever. We all know that. We are going to add \$1.2 trillion to the debt and we are not fixing the real problem this country is encountering, and that is the absolute collapse of the housing industry. We can spend all the money we want to spend on "stimulus" packages—which this one isn't—and it is not going to do a thing, unless we fix housing and the liquidity crisis.

I bring up this amendment because it shows how misaligned this bill is. This amendment seeks to eliminate a \$246 million earmark. It is nothing but that. It is a tax earmark for the movie industry. Let's put the history out there. The movie industry today can take advantage and write off all of its