

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the 200th anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln. On February 12, 1809, our 16th President was born to Thomas and Nancy Lincoln in Kentucky. President Lincoln spent the majority of his adult life in Illinois where he became a successful lawyer and politician. But in between these periods, he lived with his family in the backwoods of Indiana, 20 miles east of Evansville. In these famous salt lick hunting grounds near the Ohio River, the young Abe Lincoln learned about farming, suffered the death of his mother, and grew into a man. Although his potential as a leader would not be fully revealed until later in life, his experiences in Indiana formed the basis of his self-taught genius and helped shape his belief system.

Abe Lincoln's family moved to Indiana in December 1816 when Abe was 7, arriving shortly after Indiana entered the Union as the 19th State. In Kentucky, the Lincolns had struggled with legal controversies related to the title to their land. They were attracted to Indiana, in part, because buying land from the Federal Government under the clear terms of the Northwest Ordinance would eliminate these troubles. Thomas Lincoln acquired 160 acres of land near Little Pigeon Creek in what is now Spencer County and set up a farm.

The family initially lived in a three-sided cabin, known as a half-faced camp. Abraham, who was always tall for his age, helped his father with farming chores. By age 9, he began to learn the detailed skill of wielding an ax, which later would be the basis for his backwoods "rail splitter" campaign persona.

Soon after arriving in Indiana, tragedy struck the family when Nancy Lincoln died of "milk sickness" on October 5, 1818. Thomas Lincoln married Sarah Bush Johnston on December 2, 1819. Sarah Johnston and her three children from her previous marriage joined Abe and his older sister Sarah.

Being situated in a sparsely populated region of southern Indiana made access to school difficult. The closest school was a great distance over rough terrain from the Lincoln farm, and Abe's attendance was sporadic, at best. In 1859 Lincoln wrote a letter to his friend Jesse Fell describing his early life and education in Indiana:

We reached our new home about the time the State came into the Union. It was a wild region, with many bears and other wild animals still in the woods. There I grew up. There were some schools, so called; but no qualification was ever required of a teacher, beyond readin, writin, and cipherin' to the Rule of Three. If a straggler supposed to understand latin, happened to so-journ in the neighborhood, he was looked upon as a wizzard. There was absolutely nothing to excite ambition for education. Of course when I came of age I did not know much. Still somehow, I could read, write, and cipher to the Rule of Three; but that was all. I have not been to school since. The little advance I now have upon this store of education, I

have picked up from time to time under the pressure of necessity.[sic]

Thomas Lincoln, who had received no formal education himself, saw little value in Abe's schooling. But Abe's stepmother Sarah encouraged him to read on his own. Abe immersed himself in the family Bible and borrowed books from neighbors. He read Parson Weems' "Life of Washington" at an early age, as well as such classics as Benjamin Franklin's "Autobiography" and Daniel Defoe's "Robinson Crusoe."

The first exposure that President Lincoln had to political argument came at a country store owned by James Gentry, a local land owner and friend of the Lincoln family. Abe worked in Gentry's store, soaking up conversation on politics and frontier life. As Lincoln grew, his horizons expanded beyond Spencer County. In 1828, he worked on a flatboat carrying goods for Gentry all the way to New Orleans. On this trip he encountered slavery for the first time.

The Lincolns moved to Illinois in 1830 where Abe went on to become a lawyer and State politician, Member of the U.S. House of Representatives, and finally President of the United States.

The strong feelings of pride that Hoosiers feel for President Lincoln are amplified by remembrances of the President around the State. For example, the Indiana State Museum located in Indianapolis houses the largest private collection of President Lincoln memorabilia in the world. Included in this collection are signed copies of the Emancipation Proclamation and the 13th amendment, family photos, and more than 20,000 other items. Additionally, the Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial continues to fascinate visitors and preserve Lincoln's Hoosier legacy.

Hoosiers are proud to celebrate President Lincoln's life and the 14 formative years he spent in Indiana. The ties of the Lincoln family in Spencer County will never be forgotten, and new generations of Hoosiers will learn how Lincoln lifted himself up from humble circumstances to become a great President and a true American hero.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. President, today our Nation celebrates the bicentennial of Abraham Lincoln's birth, a man who became one of the finest leaders America has ever known. Given his service to our Nation, it is fitting that we pause to acknowledge President Lincoln's lasting contributions to our society.

President Lincoln was a writer, an attorney, and a statesman, but above all else he was a strong advocate for the common man. This was due in large part to the fact that he was a common man. He was born into a family with modest means, became self-educated, and entered into a life of public service at the age of 23.

During his Presidency, Lincoln once remarked, "God must love the common man, he made so many of them." He gave a voice to the disenfranchised, the

destitute, and the dispirited, and even in the face of adversity, he stood strong in support of the notion that "all men are created equal."

He also led with conviction during a turbulent time in our Nation's history. As President, Lincoln guided our divided Nation with moral clarity and persevered when the fabric of our democracy was tested. He helped to heal our Nation after the Civil War and put America on a path to overcome the dark days of slavery.

Today, President Lincoln's virtue extends far beyond our borders. He has inspired generations of individuals seeking to advance the cause of freedom and liberty even when their voices have been silenced. These individuals find inspiration in places like Havana, where a statue of Lincoln still stands proudly along the Avenida de los Presidentes. I join them in hoping for the day when Lincoln's dreams can be realized and the people of Cuba can taste the same fruits of liberty we as Americans cherish.

On this day, we are reminded not only of Lincoln's contributions to our society, but also his vision, which continues to guide our Nation. May his life continue to inspire us and his words always serve as a source of hope. As he once wrote, "The cause of liberty must not be surrendered at the end of one, or even one hundred defeats." May God bless Abraham Lincoln, and may He continue to bless the United States of America.

#### RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 1 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 11:24 a.m., recessed and reassembled at 1 p.m. when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. UDALL of Colorado).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

#### STIMULUS PACKAGE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I will share a few remarks about the stimulus package that we understand is making its way here after going through conference. I believe there may be some opportunity to change what is in it. I hope so because one of the most disappointing aspects of the process we have been going through is that I was denied a vote on an amendment that would simply say that every business that gets contracts out of this job stimulus package will have to use the very simple-to-operate E-verify system that over one hundred thousand American corporations are using voluntarily.

With that system, you simply punch in the Social Security number of a job applicant in order to verify work eligibility. Employers run the social security number through the system and they receive information as to whether this individual has a legitimate Social

Security number. It accurately identifies quite a number of people illegally in the country who are passing themselves off as being legal. In fact, we have had testimony over the years that there are quite a number of individuals who have used the same social security number; possibly thousands who have used the same Social Security number. Until the E-Verify program, nobody checked.

This system has successfully been set up. President Bush was somewhat reluctant but moved forward with it, and the system is up and running. It was supposed to be fully implemented for every business in America. It is available to every business in America today on a voluntarily basis. Last year, the Bush Administration issued Executive Order 12989, which would require all Federal Government contractors and subcontractors to use E-Verify.

It is not an unusual idea. It is a popular idea in the House, the Senate and with the American people. Out of all the potential applicant queries made, E-Verify only identifies about 3 percent a year who are apparently not legally in the country and should not be getting a job. We are passing a bill, a huge piece of legislation that, frankly, is less stimulative and less job creative than we would like it to be.

Gary Becker and one of his partners, a Nobel Prize economist, in the Wall Street Journal yesterday wrote a big piece in which he questioned how many jobs would actually be created and how stimulative this package is. It has too much in it that is not stimulative. He said you would normally hope to get 1.5 percent of GDP of stimulation for every dollar spent. In his opinion, because of the way it is written, it would be less than 1 percent. Not good.

The idea was to create jobs, but not for people illegally in the country; for Americans, legal Americans. These include citizens, green cardholders and legal workers in America. They should all be eligible for jobs created under this bill, but not illegally here should not.

The House unanimously accepted 2 E-Verify amendments. The House passed legislation by Congressman CALVERT of California that said the E-verify system, which will expire this spring, will be extended for 4 years. In addition to being accepted in their stimulus bill, that language passed the House 407 to 2 last July. Unfortunately, the Democrat majority blocked the Senate from voting on it in the last Congress.

Congressman KINGSTON offered an amendment that every contractor who gets money under the stimulus bill should use E-verify to try to ensure the people who are hired, those who get jobs, are lawful Americans.

How much simpler can it be than that? How much more common sense can we have in a bill than that? That was accepted as part of the final package. When the vote was held in the House, I guess all but 11 Democrats voted for both of those provisions.

They are kind of proud of themselves. They are telling their constituents: I voted to make sure, as best we could—it is not a perfect system—but as best we could, that contractors would use E-verify and prohibit some of the people who should not be getting jobs from doing so.

Then when I offered an identical amendment in the Senate, it was never allowed to be brought up for a vote. I have been through this process for some time. I have seen how things work. I am beginning to see what might be afoot. I know that the majority leader, Senator REID, whom I respect so much, who has such a difficult job—I don't see how anybody can handle it—but he has to make decisions. He has made one with which I don't agree.

Somewhere along the way, the leadership decided they would not allow the Senate to vote on this amendment, although they claimed everybody gets votes on their amendments. They would not allow a vote on it.

Why was this significant? My amendment, supported by Senator BEN NELSON, one of the people who helped arrange this final settlement, a Democratic Senator, an experienced Governor—was the same as the language included in the House version of this bill. Under our rules, if the Senate passes legislation that has the same language as the House, it should remain in the final bill. It should not be taken out. If it was validated by both Houses of Congress, it should not be altered by the conferees. But if one body does not have the language in their version of the bill, then the conferees have a choice. They can either take the House language that had the E-verify provisions in it, or they could take the Senate language that did not.

Let me tell you why I was pretty worried about it. Under this maneuver, this is what happened. The House Members all get to claim they voted for it, and the Senate Members never have to say they voted against it. If anybody complains about it not being in the bill, any Member of the Senate can say: I would have voted for it; I just didn't get the vote. That works a lot of times, and it is not good because I truly believe that if this amendment had been voted on in the Senate, it would have received very large bipartisan support.

I don't think there is any doubt in my mind that many Senators would take the position that E-verify, an essential system for creating a lawful system of immigration, should be extended. I think very few Senators would take the position that somebody getting money under this jobs package, this stimulus package paid for by the American taxpayers, shouldn't have to hire those who are not lawfully in the country.

I am disappointed. I think the American people should be disappointed.

I want to go back a little bit further and discuss it some more because I firmly believe that one reason the

American people distrust Congress and that we have such a low approval rating is this very kind of manipulation and chicanery.

Back when the effort was made to move the comprehensive immigration bill in the Judiciary Committee, it would have given, I think it is fair to say, amnesty to those here illegally, while only promising a lot of enforcement measures in the future. During markup in the Judiciary Committee, I offered several amendments to tighten up enforcement. I was a little bit surprised because amendments I had offered before were accepted, amendments to extend the fence, to add to the number of investigators, and to add necessary detention space so people could be deported if they were apprehended.

Two years ago, we were apprehending 1.1 million people a year attempting to enter the country illegally. We arrested that many people at the border and we had a lot of things we needed to do.

It finally dawned on me what was happening. This is what happened in 1986. Why did the 1986 amnesty bill ultimately fail? The amnesty bill in 1986 gave legal status and a path to citizenship for millions—it turned out to be more than estimated—but it promised enforcement. What I want you to know is the amnesty provisions become law at once. But the enforcement was merely a promise. Unless the money for enforcement is actually appropriated by the appropriators, no additional Border Patrol agents get added, no fence and barriers get built, no detention spaces get added, no systems, such as E-verify, get set up. That is why it failed before, and I saw that we were heading down the same path again in 2006 and 2007.

Those of us who questioned the legislation and demanded that we have confidence in the enforcement provisions did not receive those assurances. And that is why the American people made their voice heard and the bill ended up going down in flames with an overwhelming vote against it. This was a far different outcome than people had been projecting even a few months before.

I remember how we handled the amendment I offered on defensive barriers at the border. It was obvious that at the California border, barriers were working. We wanted to extend that barrier. I introduced an amendment to authorize the construction of barriers of various kinds—some vehicles, some fixed—and it would pass with 86 votes. But when the appropriations bills came back, where we actually disburse the money to fund these programs, the money for the barriers was not included. So we began to have a serious discussion on the floor of the Senate about that kind of duplicity, I felt, where we would vote overwhelmingly to take an action and then when came time to put up the money to make it happen, we would vote it down, and everybody would say: I voted to build a

fence. It is not my fault. It just didn't happen.

I want to say, this is what is happening with these E-Verify provisions. The American people need to know it. This was a very reasonable and restrained provision. It is common sense, if there is any such thing as common sense associated with the way this stimulus bill was handled. It tries to help Americans get jobs. Unemployment is up to 7.6 percent now. Unfortunately, I think it may go up more. Why in the world would we not take this reasonable, simple step to try to ensure that the \$800 billion we are spending goes to American citizens or those lawfully in our country? It does not create police. It does not create enforcement. It does not create a bureaucracy. It simply extends the already successful program and says every employer ought to use this simple E-verify system, a 2-minute computer check to find out if the person is likely to be illegal or legal.

I could not imagine why we would not do that, but now I understand. I saw one publication, an inside trade publication that said the chicken processors and the Chamber of Commerce, big business Chamber of Commerce, had written the leaders and asked them not to pass my amendment. They didn't write to me. They didn't write to other Members. Somebody is talking in secret. Somewhere, somehow this plan was developed to keep this provision from becoming part of this law. And it is not right. I protested. Three or four times I came to this floor, and I asked that this language either be put in the bill or that, at the very least, the Senate be allowed to vote on it. I expressed my concern that this very thing was happening. But the leadership in the Senate has the power to pick and choose the amendments they allow to be voted on, and they didn't want this one to be voted on. They didn't want it because they didn't want the language in the bill, I conclude. What else could I conclude because if we had had a vote, it would have passed, I am convinced.

Senator BEN NELSON and I supported it. We had a whole lot of Members on the Democratic side who did not go for this last comprehensive immigration bill. This is just a tiny step compared to that historic vote. I believe virtually all of our Members would have believed this was a reasonable amendment, and, overwhelmingly, I am confident a strong majority would have voted for it and it would have been in the bill.

So that is the kind of thing we are doing. If people are unhappy with their Congress and the process we have ongoing, then they need to do like they did back during the immigration debate and send letters and make phone calls. That apparently made a tremendous difference then.

You may ask: Well, why did the conference not include the House-passed language; isn't there a process? Well,

the Senate conference was very small, and the Senate conferees were a majority of Democrats selected by the majority leader. In the House they have a majority appointed by the Speaker. That means basically the Speaker and the majority leader control what comes out of the conference. They pick the people who run it and vote on it and they get to decide. So somewhere along the way the Speaker and the majority leader agreed to take this language out. It should not have happened. It should have been in this bill, and I am very sorry it was not.

Mr. President, I will just say that will be one of the reasons I will oppose this bill. I am very disappointed we didn't have the free ability this great Senate is so famous for to have a vote on a clearly relevant, germane amendment. It was already in the House bill. That guarantees it to be a germane amendment. It would be germane under any circumstances, I believe. I am deeply disappointed we didn't have a right to vote on that.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, to follow up on my earlier remarks about E-Verify, I would note it is ironic that it appears the final version of this legislation will result in a huge expansion of Government, but it also could result in termination of a key program, and that is the E-Verify Program. It has been proven to be successful. People like it—on a bipartisan basis they like it—and it will terminate this spring if we don't do something about it.

According to both Robert Rector at the Heritage Foundation, and Steven Camarota from the Center for Immigration Studies—Mr. Rector was the architect of welfare reform and one of the best minds in the country on these issues—this legislation we are talking about passing today or tomorrow could result in several hundred thousand jobs being given to illegal immigrants—several hundred thousand.

The version of the stimulus bill that passed the Senate contained \$104 billion in construction spending, including highways, schools, and public housing. Only about \$30 billion is for highways—a little over 3 percent of the bill's value, just for perspective—but it would total about \$104 billion for infrastructure and construction. Government estimates suggest this spending could create about 2 million new construction jobs.

Consistent with other research, the Center for Immigration Studies has previously estimated that 15 percent of construction workers are illegal immigrants, which means about 300,000 of

the construction jobs created by the Senate stimulus plan could go to those who are not lawfully in the country.

The E-Verify—formerly called the Basic Pilot/Employment Eligibility Verification Program—is an online system operated jointly by the Department of Homeland Security and the Social Security Administration. Participating employers can check the work status of new hires online by comparing information from the employee's submitted I-9 form against the Social Security and Department of Homeland Security databases. More than 107,000 employers voluntarily are using that system today, and happily so.

E-Verify is free—it doesn't cost the employer anything—it is voluntary, and the best means available for determining employment eligibility for new hires and the validity of their Social Security number. According to the Department of Homeland Security, 96.1 percent of employees are cleared automatically, and growth continues at a rate of 2,000 additional businesses using the system each week.

Now, this 96 percent, I know, is for all employees and all companies, and I am sure there might be a higher number with construction workers. As of February 2, 2009, there have been over 2.5 million inquiries through the system. In 2008, there were more than 6.6 million inquiries run. The number is really going up.

An employer who verifies work authorization under the E-Verify system has an advantage. That employer has created a rebuttable presumption that they have taken reasonable steps to make sure they are not filling their employment rolls with illegals. If the investigators come out and find someone who is illegal, they can say: Well, I ran the number on your system, and if it had been bad, I wouldn't have hired them and I can show you where that cleared your system. So it protects the employer from any false charges.

So Senator BEN NELSON and I wrote a letter to Senators REID and MCCONNELL asking that this legislation include provisions to require E-Verify for the jobs created under this proposal.

As an aside, there is another problem, and we might as well talk about it. I was very worried and concerned because, on January 28 of this year, President Obama pushed back the implementation of Executive Order No. 12989, executed by President Bush, which would require all Federal contractors and subcontractors to use E-Verify. In other words, those who are doing work now on military bases and roads and other things would be required to use a successful system that has long been planned and being phased in. Now, the implementation date has been pushed back to May 21.

So are we now seeing some sort of serious movement to undermine one of the most effective, least intrusive systems we have ever developed, the cornerstone of Homeland Security's enforcement efforts? I don't know. When

you add that decision to what has happened on the floor of the Senate, my concerns are increasing.

Recently, the Bureau of Labor Statistics reported that the unemployment rate in January had gotten to 7.6 percent, including 598,000 jobs lost in January. This is the highest unemployment rate in 17 years. We know and expect it will go higher—hopefully, not a whole lot higher, but certainly those trends are not good.

Immigration by illegal immigrants and other poorly educated aliens has a serious and depressing effect on the standard of living of low-skilled, hard-working Americans, and I will tell you that is a fact. The United States Commission on Immigration Reform, chaired by the late civil rights pioneer, Barbara Jordan, found that immigration of unskilled immigrants comes at a cost to unskilled U.S. workers. I don't think there is any doubt about that.

The Center for Immigration Studies has estimated that such immigration has reduced the wage of the average native-born worker in a low-skilled occupation by 12 percent or \$2,000 a year. It may not impact people in universities and Senators, but hard-working Americans are having to compete against persons who are willing to work for so much less and who often are being taken advantage of.

I just give this aside: I talked to the CEO of a company—a family company. They do right-of-way clearing and other type work of that kind for utilities in States and counties. He said they have had good employees. They have hired them for many years. They pay retirement and health care benefits and competitive wages. All of a sudden, just a few years ago, they started losing bid after bid after bid. They could not understand how the competitor could bid so low. They began to look into it, and it appears, quite clear to him, the reason a company from Texas was able to outbid him was because they were paying their employees much less, and he believes many of them were illegally in the country. Now, how did that help his employees? He may be forced to go out of business simply because he was obeying the law.

In addition, a Harvard economist, Professor George Borjas, who has written a book on this subject—himself a Cuban refugee; at a young age he came from Cuba—has estimated that immigration in recent decades has reduced the wages of native-born workers without a high school degree by 8.2 percent.

Doris Meissner, former head of INS—the immigration service—under President Clinton, wrote this in February of this year:

Mandatory employer verification must be at the center of legislation to combat illegal immigration. The E-Verify system provides a valuable tool for employers who are trying to comply with the law. E-Verify also provides an opportunity to determine the best electronic means to implement verification requirements. The administration should

support reauthorization of E-Verify and expand the program.

That is Doris Meissner, who is certainly a moderate on immigration issues. She served under President Clinton and said just recently this is a key thing for us to do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the Chair, and I would suggest finally that these are very important issues for American citizens. We need to speak out clearly on them.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. President, we are in a period of morning business, up to 10 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

#### STIMULUS CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. President, I rise to speak on the conference report to the so-called stimulus bill. While we have not seen the actual bill, the outlines of the final agreement are available, and not much has changed from the bill since it passed the Senate earlier this week. The bill will still cost more than \$1 trillion over the next 10 years after interest on the borrowed money necessary to finance the bill is added. This is \$1 trillion added to our national debt and \$1 trillion we have to take away from our American workers in the future to pay off that debt. That is why the bill also raises the limit on the national debt to over \$12 trillion. That is almost a \$2 trillion increase in the national debt.

But \$1 trillion of new debt is not the whole story. Many of the tax and spending provisions in this bill last only a few months or years. The President and many in Congress have promised to extend those provisions or even make them permanent. Obviously, that means the cost of the bill as written does not show the true cost of the changes it puts in place. In fact, in a letter sent yesterday, the Congressional Budget Office said that when you add in the cost of extending the programs the President has promised to extend, the total cost of the bill over the next 10 years is actually \$2½ trillion. Add the interest on that \$2½ trillion of new debt, and the bill will cost the taxpayer \$3.3 trillion over the next 10 years. That is \$3.3 trillion we will have to tax our children, my grandchildren and your grandchildren, and our neighbors.

It is true the conference report is a bit smaller than the House-passed bill, so those numbers will have to be figured again when the final language is available, but they are close enough to understand the massive size of this debt spending bill.

If all this new debt spending would actually fix the economy and create jobs, it might be worth it. But that is not what is going to happen. Even the

Congressional Budget Office agrees with that. In another letter they sent yesterday, they said the bill will reduce—you heard me right—reduce GDP over the long term. They also estimated it will lower wages over the long term because Government spending now will take money away from productive use by the private sector later.

We cannot spend our way out of this crisis. The solution to the crisis that was created by too much debt is not more debt, and America cannot afford to waste several trillion dollars. If we really want to stimulate the economy, we need to focus our attention on tax cuts for individuals, investments, and businesses. We need to enact legislation that will have a direct and immediate impact. We need a bill that will create more jobs through targeted tax relief, not a bill that will spend money on programs that offer no immediate or long-term return to the American taxpayer. We could have done that on this bill, but the majority refused to work with the minority to craft a truly bipartisan bill. In all of Congress, there were only 3 members of the minority who supported this flawed spending bill, and 3 out of 218 does not make this a bipartisan bill.

I hope the actual bill is made available with time for Senators and the American public to examine it before we vote. I cannot support the conference report that has been described by the House and Senate leadership, and I hope we can do better the next time.

I ask unanimous consent that the two letters from the Congressional Budget Office that I mentioned earlier be printed in the RECORD.

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

U.S. CONGRESS,  
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,  
Washington, DC, February 11, 2009.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,  
Ranking Member, Committee on the Budget,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN, as you requested, the Congressional Budget Office and the Joint Committee on Taxation have estimated the impact of permanently extending more than 20 of the provisions contained in H.R. 1, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, as passed by the House of Representatives. As specified in H.R. 1 as passed, those provisions would either explicitly expire or would specify appropriations only for a limited number of years (usually 2009 and 2010).

CBO estimates that H.R. 1, as passed by the House of Representatives, would increase budget deficits by about \$820 billion over the 2009-2019 period; we estimate that permanently extending the programs you identified would increase the cumulative deficit over that period by another \$1.7 trillion (see attached table).

As you requested, the Congressional Budget Office has also estimated the costs of debt service that would result from enacting the bill with these extensions. Such costs are not included in CBO's cost estimates for individual pieces of legislation and are not counted for Congressional scorekeeping purposes for such legislation. If the specified provisions of H.R. 1 are continued, under