

But when Jefferson wrote those words only a small pool of white landowners got to choose who governed them.

Since then, through acts of state legislatures, the Congress and the courts the right to vote has been extended to men over 21—regardless of property ownership—to newly freed black men who, along with their families, had previously counted as just three fifths of a person, and then to women and to 18 year olds.

And after extending those rights we further decided that each of these votes should count equally—“one man, one vote,” and that no one legally entitled to vote could be denied the franchise by a poll tax or voting test.

The men and women of the District—a city of nearly 600,000—fight in our wars and pay Federal taxes; yet, they have no say on issues of war and peace or how their money is spent.

Perhaps the ultimate slight of denying the right to vote to District residents was that if an American were to move abroad, their right to vote in their home State was guaranteed, regardless of how long they remained out of the country. The only way they could lose that right was if they were to either renounce their citizenship or return to the United States and live in Washington, DC.

Today we fixed this situation and we can all be proud of our work.

I want to thank Senator REID for bringing this to the floor and thank his outstanding floor staff—as well as other Democratic and Republican Senate staffers—for their hard work.

And finally, I would like to take a moment to thank Michael Alexander, Kevin Landy, Holly Idelson Deborah Parkinson, Leslie Phillips, Scott Campbell, David Rosenbaum and the rest of the staff of the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee staff for their hard work in bringing this bill successfully to the floor of the Senate.

I am proud to share this historic moment with them.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized.

#### CAPTIVE PRIMATE SAFETY ACT

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I rise to speak about a terrible thing that happened in his home State. I am going to be asking unanimous consent at the appropriate time to move a bill, H.R. 80, the Captive Primate Safety Act. I will preface it first by saying to my friend, Senator LIEBERMAN, that in his State there was a horrific attack.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. In my hometown.

Mrs. BOXER. Yes. It was an attack by a nonhuman primate—a chimpanzee in this case—that was a household pet, against a woman. Without going into the terrible details, I think the whole country was shocked at what occurred there.

Many of us have been saying for a long time that we need to fix this prob-

lem. In 1978, importing nonhuman primates to the U.S. for pet trade was banned by the CDC in regulations. But now you can still trade these primates in the pet trade and sell them for use as pets. We say it is time to end that.

I know Senator COBURN is going to object to our moving this bill which was passed by the House quickly and in a bipartisan way with just a handful of “no” votes. Can’t we come together on this? The fact is, our bill says we are going to ban pet trading of these nonhuman primates, and we are going to get this done one way or another. We will not get it done today because Senator COBURN will object for his reasons. I believe it is important to state that our bill—and this is a Boxer-Vitter bill—has no impact on trade or transportation of animals for zoos or scientific research facilities or other federally licensed and regulated entities. All we are saying is that it is dangerous to keep as a pet a nonhuman primate. We saw this in Connecticut, but that was not the only time. There have been many examples. When we get this done, we will list those. We have been trying to get this passed for a long time. Senator COBURN objected. We will get around it at some point in time.

Primates can harbor many infectious diseases that can readily jump from species to humans. As a result, the CDC, back in 1975, said: No, no importation of those nonhuman primates unless it is for medical reasons or a zoo or to a Federal body that is going to oversee it. Listen to how many people have been injured. More than 150 people. How about children? Do you care about children? Forty children were injured by these nonhuman primates between 1995 and 2009. Nineteen States, including my own, have prohibited these animals as pets. Fourteen States restrict or partially ban their use as pets because many of these animals move in interstate commerce.

Federal legislation is needed. You would think this is a no-brainer—you would think. Who supports this legislation? Well, the House of Representatives just passed it overwhelmingly on suspension of the rules. It wasn’t even a problem over there. The Humane Society of the United States supports it. The American Veterinary Medical Association supports it. The Association of Zoos and Aquariums supports it. The Jane Goodall Institute supports it. The Wildlife Conservation Society supports it. That is a very small portion. I cannot believe I actually had to come out here today.

With all due respect to my friend, he will have his reasons, but, honestly, I hoped that once in a while we could work together on a bill that is so obvious in its need.

We know these nonhuman primates have not been bred and domesticated over thousands of years like dogs or cats. It is a whole different world there. That is why the veterinarians support us. Nobody loves pets more

than the Humane Society. Nobody loves pets more, but they know what can happen. A woman got her face ripped off.

So I am not going to go into the details of the attack at this time, but if I have to I will to get the votes of colleagues.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 80, the Captive Primate Safety Act, which was received from the House; and, further, that the bill be read the third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. COBURN. Reserving the right to object, and I do, I ask unanimous consent to be recognized for 5 minutes to make comments regarding what has just been said.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have 5 minutes following my friend from Oklahoma, and then I ask unanimous consent that Senator SANDERS have 15 minutes on his subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard to proceeding to the measure.

Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COBURN. Madam President, on February 16, 2009, a pet non-human primate, NHP, attacked Ms. Nash, a friend of the pet’s owner—almost killing her. My thoughts and prayers are with Ms. Nash and I am sure I join all of my colleagues in wishing her a speedy and full recovery.

This unfortunate event has rushed consideration of the Captive Primate Safety Act, H.R. 80. H.R. 80 would make it illegal to import, export, transport, sell, receive, acquire, or purchase non-human primates, such as monkeys and apes, by amending the over 100-year old Lacey Act to include “any nonhuman primate.”

H.R. 80 does not affect laboratory animals, zoos, and some veterinarian cases.

This bill does not address a national priority and should not be considered by Congress.

Last Congress, I held the similar Senate version of the Captive Primate Safety Act, S. 1498, because of concerns with its fiscal impact and because I did not believe it was appropriate for the Federal Government to be regulating pets.

Today the Senate is trying to pass the similar House version that still seeks to increase Federal regulation of pets in a fiscally irresponsible manner without amendments or debate.

Supporters of this bill hope that somehow creating a new Federal law to prohibit transporting pet primates across State lines, on top of the Federal laws and regulations that already make it illegal to import them and the dozens of State laws that outlaw owning non-human primates as pets, and

giving the Fish and Wildlife Service \$5 million to hire extra “law enforcement” staff to pursue chimps will make Americans safer.

Supporters of this measure are using the tragedy that occurred this month to ram this bill through Congress with no debate. This attack occurred in Connecticut, where a State law already existed that outlawed the possession of NHP’s weighing more than 50 pounds without a permit. The NHP weighed 200 pounds and should have not been allowed under state law to live with its owner as a pet, but passing the Captive Primate Safety Act last year would not have prevented this tragedy and is not a national priority.

The bill authorizes \$5 million in fiscal year 2010 to hire additional United States Fish and Wildlife Service law enforcement personnel to enforce the new monkey provisions and CBO says the bill will cost taxpayers \$17 million over 5 years. To enact such legislation without any offsets and therefore simply add to our national debt is extremely imprudent at this time in our nation.

There still have been no hearings and therefore no official statement or testimony available from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service as to whether or not this law is necessary and/or enforceable within the agency’s current resources.

There is even a more basic question of whether or not a Federal wildlife agency should be regulating interstate pet transportation at all.

This law may be duplicative, unnecessary, and ineffective.

This matter of pet ownership may be more appropriately and effectively handled by local and State governments and agencies.

The UC does not allow an opportunity to amend this bill to address cost concerns.

This Bill spends money we don’t have on something that is unnecessary.

CBO estimated last Congress that both the House and the Senate versions of the Captive Safety Act and last Congress’s Senate bill, would cost \$17 million over 5 years. H.R. 80 is almost identical to last Congress’s House bill.

According to CBO, the cost of hiring four additional U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, FWS, employees to conduct inspections and investigations and storing, transporting and boarding confiscated NHP’s totals \$17 million over 5 years.

The costs may in fact be even higher. According to one chimp sanctuary the annual cost to house two chimpanzees can exceed \$35,000 a year. According to the Humane Society of the United States and various Members of Congress, there are an estimated 15,000 non-human primates in private hands. If the FWS were to try and confiscate and then house all 15,000 chimps, that could add up to a total cost of \$262.5 million a year for the federal taxpayers, or \$1.3 billion over 5 years.

The unanimous consent agreement would not allow anyone to offer amend-

ments to offset the cost of this bill or perhaps cut back on other areas within the Fish and Wildlife’s jurisdiction to pay for these new responsibilities.

Fourteen Monkey bites a year do not justify annual appropriations of \$4 Million.

While the Humane Society of the United States said in a February 2009 press release that the Captive Primates Safety Act is an “urgently needed public safety and animal welfare measure,” other Americans may feel differently about prioritizing this issue above more pressing national issues.

The group justifies prioritizing H.R. 80 with American taxpayer resources because of recent captive primate incidents. An analysis of its list of “recent incidents involving captive primates” finds:

In 2008, 11 monkeys were reported as being involved in biting 14 people. One of the monkeys was in a university laboratory and another was in a wildlife sanctuary. Both of these types of monkeys are exempted and therefore would not be affected by the Captive Primates Safety Act.

In 2008, there were 39 non-human primates involved in 21 incidents, but 28 of the 39 monkeys involved in the reported incidents were not noted as having harmed humans.

Similarly, last Congress, the Humane Society and the Senate EPW committee justified the creation of a new Federal law by citing 132 reported incidents of human injury from captive or escaped captive primates over a 10-year period—which still averages out to only 13 a year.

In contrast, 4.7 million Americans are bitten by dogs each year, according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Taking both the Humane Society and the CBO score together, the bill before us today, essentially calls for the Federal Government to spend the equivalent of over \$444,000 per year to take nine biting monkeys out of their private owners’ hands. Using another measurement, the FWS would spend the equivalent of over \$285,000 per bite—\$4 million divided by 14 people who were bitten by monkeys in 2008—if this bill passed.

Yet even these cost estimates may be understated because it is possible that none of the nine offending monkeys will ever cross State lines. In that case, unless State or local laws and officials caused their removal, these pets would remain with their owners.

While not seeking to diminish the physical or psychological effects of any monkey bites or attacks, taxpayers have a right to question if such a small number of incidents justify the large cost to the Federal Government of taking on additional animal control responsibilities.

In contrast, though some of the 4.7 million Americans bitten by dogs each year die as a result of these bites, Congress is not adding interstate dog transport to the lists of Federal wild-

life responsibilities and prohibitions. If preventing human injuries caused by pets was a national priority, why aren’t Senators and special interest groups pushing to outlaw the private ownership of dogs?

Passing the Captive Safety Act last Congress would not have prevented the recent attack.

Tragically, a 200-pound, 15-year-old chimpanzee named Travis—who was raised by the same owners since he was an infant—brutally attacked one of his owner’s friends, Charla Nash, outside his house in Stamford, CT, in February 2009. The chimp, for still unknown reasons, attacked Ms. Nash, severely damaging her face and hands, according to news reports. She is in critical but stable condition. Travis died after being stabbed by his owner and being shot by a police officer after he charged the officer.

Following the recent chimp attack, the Humane Society has argued that if I had not held last year’s bill, S. 1498, Ms. Nash would not have been attacked. This statement, however, is incorrect, because this bill would have only have removed Travis from his owner if the NHP crossed State lines.

Additionally, since 2004 under Connecticut State law it has been illegal to own an NHP weighing more than 50 pounds if the animal is not registered. Yet, State officials did not even require Travis—a 200 pound NHP—to be registered, even though he was well known. It appears Travis lived in Stamford, CT, for most of his life. His attack took place in front of his home. With the possible exception of an appearance on the Maury Povich show, which may or may not have been filmed in the New York City studio, nothing indicates that Travis was crossing state lines on a regular basis, nor did his unprovoked attack have any interstate aspect to it. The fact that he might have been born in another State 15 years ago, would not have affected Travis’s private ownership 2 weeks ago if this bill had been signed into law last year.

What if Travis or his siblings grew up in the same State where they were born? The bill does nothing to address this situation; they have to cross State lines to fall under Federal jurisdiction. Why is a chimp native to and living in Missouri ok, but one moving to Connecticut, for example should suddenly become the business of the Federal Government? It is very unlikely that Travis’ trip 15 years ago across a few State lines led to his attack in February. This is yet another reason why this bill is a misplaced priority and misguided effort.

If people are saying all chimps are dangerous and are against private ownership of nonhuman primates, why doesn’t this bill simply make it a Federal crime to own them and take away the estimated 15,000 animals in private hands? Instead, to justify questionable Federal involvement, Congress is using the interstate commerce clause even

though this approach is both inappropriate and ineffective.

In a recent Boston Herald article April Truitt, director of the Primate Rescue Center in Kentucky, had the following to say regarding H.R. 80:

"It's better than nothing, which is what approximately 30 states have right now," she said. But if the bill becomes law, it will affect few dealers in exotic animals.

"Dealers are not one bit concerned about this," Truitt said. "They know that they still can continue to do what they were doing. Most dealers are USDA licensed, and the USDA licensing has been and is used by private owners rampantly to circumvent state and local legislation."

Others, such as Sian Evans, the director of the DuMond Conservancy for Primates and Tropical Forests, contend that in general, NHPs do not carry disease and should not be considered a threat to the safety of others.

While the recent attack is tragic, this bill is not an appropriate or responsible use of taxpayer funds and Congressional resources.

Federal law already exists banning non-human primate imports.

It has also already been illegal for the past 30 years to import non-human primates, such as monkeys, for pets. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention: "Since 1975, the Federal Quarantine Regulations, (42CFR71.53), have restricted the importation of NHP . . . Importation of NHP for use as pets is not permitted under any circumstances."

The Humane Society of the United States previously acknowledged, "Most states regulate keeping primates as pets, and the trend is for states to prohibit the practice altogether." Yet the group also claims, "federal legislation is needed to complement state laws" because "many of these animals move in interstate commerce."

In conclusion, Congress recently justified swift passage of a massive spending bill that increases the national debt by more than \$1 trillion to more than \$10 billion in the midst of a struggling national economy. In January, the national unemployment rate was 7.6 percent—the highest it has been in more than 15 years. In December, national home prices plunged at the fastest pace on record, leading to predictions of 6 million foreclosures over the next four years. Consumer confidence levels have dropped to a new low of 25 in February from 37.4 a month earlier as people worry about losing their jobs, earning less, and deteriorating prospects.

Yet the Humane Society and certain Members of Congress are seeking to make this pet regulation bill a national priority and are pushing to have it enacted quickly. How is potentially preventing a few monkey bites a bigger national priority than trying to address the weakening economy and collapsing consumer and business environment?

These "little" bills add up and once privately owned monkeys are added to the Department of Interior's jurisdic-

tion, they will likely be there forever, not just for the 5 years authorized in this bill.

This bill would not have stopped the attack on Ms. Nash. My objection does not question the seriousness of her attack but lies in moving an inappropriate, ineffective, and irresponsible bill in the midst of a time of real need in our country for strong leadership. Congress cannot afford to continue to misprioritize scarce resources and must focus on truly national priorities—not on monkey bites and inappropriate special-interest legislation.

Madam President, not once have I had a call from my colleague asking: Will you work with me on this issue? Will you protect people as a result of this issue? Will you help us pass this? What it has been is: Take it or leave it.

I note for the record that 90 Members in the House voted against the bill. It was not a smattering few. A fourth of the House did not agree with this legislation.

I have never been asked: Would you care if we eliminated the ownership of these pets? I don't have any problem with that, but I have never been asked that. That has never been offered.

The question in the case that brings this back up is Connecticut has a law and the law says you can hold and register a nonhuman primate if it weighs under 50 pounds. What happened in Connecticut is they violated their own law. They had a restriction on it.

I am not opposed to commonsense eliminating the risk from nonhuman primates, but I have never been approached in how I would work with that to try to accomplish what the Senator from California would like to accomplish and still meet the needs of individual Americans and their civil liberties.

The second point I note, if we are going to do this, look, there were 4.6 million dog bites last year that caused hundreds of thousands of serious injuries. Are we going to stop the interstate transport of dogs that caused thousands and thousands more injuries, some even deaths, to individuals? Nobody is proposing that.

What I ask my colleague is reach out. I would gladly work with Senator BOXER in a way so we eliminate any future ownership of these types of animals in a way that does not violate those who presently have them and encourages the States to enforce their laws that they have today and enforce them in the future.

We can start at a time certain tomorrow and say: You can't have new ownership of any nonhuman primate. That stops all interstate commerce. That stops it completely. But our problem is we have about 30 States that have regulations in regard to this issue.

The incident that happened in Connecticut is very unfortunate, I agree. But what happened was you had the law broken. So instead of enforcing a law that is on the books, we are going to create another new law, and it is not

going to accomplish the very purpose. We are still going to have nonhuman primate bites if we do not have some way to ultimately end this type of pet selection.

I reach out to my colleague. I am sorry I had to object. I will gladly work with her in the future to come to some accommodation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, while my friend was speaking, I went back to my staff because this is not the first time we have had a problem on it. We had it in the big Coburn package of bills, and I remember my friend at that time made it the centerpiece of his objection. My staff has talked with his staff over and over again. The Republican staff on my committee, from where this bill came, has talked to the Senator over and over again.

I am happy to sit down with my friend. Maybe we can work this out. But here is the point. My friend says that what happened to this woman is unfortunate. No, what happened to this woman is a tragedy.

We do not go in and take away pets from anybody, if you read this bill. If you have a pet, you have a pet as long as you are living within the laws of your State. We ban the interstate trade because that is how this thing is moving forward. People get these pets, and they sell them across State lines. That is how we ban a lot of bad in this country. It is the way we have done it for a long time.

I just want to say to my friend, I didn't know this rose to the level where he and I should speak. I am delighted to sit down and talk with him. But the fact is, our staffs have been working with his staff for a very long time on this issue. Senator VITTER's staff and Senator INHOFE's staff have been working with the Senator's staff to try to get a breakthrough.

I hope the two of us can sit down, and maybe without our staffs—maybe the problem is our staffs. I have a great staff. I am sure Senator COBURN does too. But maybe there is something that got in the way of their being able to resolve it. But I think he and I should sit down, and I will try to see if I can move this again, maybe with some kind of way we can fix it that doesn't give the Senator heartburn.

Honest to God, I say to my friend, we have made sure nobody is going to be invaded by a police force and lose their pet. That is not in here. Only if you try to move it across State lines, you wouldn't be allowed to sell your pet so that pet can injure somebody. Nobody is taking away anybody's pets. Nobody is stopping the zoos from getting these pets. Nobody is stopping research facilities from getting these pets. That is why we have such strong support for this legislation.

I am not a person who says my way or the highway, believe me. I have been here too long. I have gotten too many

bills passed. I will sit down with my friend. He is right that 90-some people on the other side voted no, but 300-some people voted aye. So we must have done something right here when we got over 300 votes in a body that has a hard time getting bipartisanship.

I say what we did right is we have a balanced bill. We allow these pets to be used for that which helps humanity, but we will, in effect, stop the interstate trade, the profitable pet trade which is leading us into a situation where we have seen so many injuries of children—40 children, about 100 adults injured between 1995 and 2009.

I am encouraged that my friend wants to work with me. I am going to go right over there as soon as I finish these remarks and figure out a way we can work on this issue because we do not want to wake up another day and read about somebody having an injury that is so horrific and horrible that they will never have a normal life when it is in our power to do what is right here and move forward.

I will not renew my request, but I will another day at a date, hopefully, when I have the support of my friend.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

(The remarks of Mr. SANDERS are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

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

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

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

#### NATIONAL PEACE CORPS WEEK

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to recognize an organization that serves on the frontline of our Nation's most important international and humanitarian efforts—the U.S. Peace Corps. This week, the Peace Corps celebrates its 48th anniversary, and this is National Peace Corps Week.

Since the early 1960s, more than 195,000 Peace Corps volunteers have fostered positive relationships between the United States and nations across the globe through its grassroots efforts.

At present, 7,500 or more Peace Corps volunteers are active in over 75 countries around the world. These volun-

teers are exposed to a diverse array of cultures and languages during their time abroad. Approximately 22 percent of the Peace Corps volunteers are currently working in 16 predominantly Muslim countries. It is in these countries, in particular, where I believe the efforts of the volunteers are positively shaping and improving the much beleaguered and much misunderstood image of America within the Muslim world.

But there is still much work to be done. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting an expansion of the Peace Corps and all of our Nation's smart power assets.

Smart power initiatives build upon our successful defense efforts and add economic and educational efforts, diplomatic efforts, including educational exchanges, free trade, public diplomacy, fostering private sector investments, agricultural development, humanitarian assistance, and English language teaching, just to name a few.

All of these smart power initiatives contribute not only to a better life for so many in need, but they also help create conditions for a more stable and peaceful world.

America and the developing world will benefit together from a greater investment in these initiatives and in particular in a revitalized and enlarged Peace Corps.

Over the past few years, the Peace Corps has received numerous inquiries about entering or reentering the countries where volunteers once served. I made similar inquiries, particularly with respect to friendly Muslim countries in Southeast Asia, such as Indonesia. Engaging moderate mainstream countries such as Indonesia with our Nation's smart power initiatives will enhance the conditions for lasting peace and stability.

Or as I like to say, putting more sandals and sneakers on the ground will prevent us from having to put more boots and bayonets on the ground in the future.

The work undertaken by Peace Corps volunteers serves as a fine example of the United States reaching out to foreign neighbors to foster a greater understanding and dialog. The willingness of Peace Corps volunteers to engage people at the local, community level is exactly how we ought to be providing effective and sustainable development assistance.

We need to get back out among the very people we are trying to help, which is why I also believe we need more USAID Foreign Service officers as well. Providing practical, hands-on assistance that is based on listening to the needs of the local population is a recipe for sustainable and lasting development. I believe that by having these kinds of contacts, we can do a great deal to improve the conditions of the countries themselves as well as the people in them. The stronger, more stable these countries are, the better our relations are in the world and the more we foster world peace.

We offer our hardy congratulations to all members, current and past, associated with the Peace Corps on its 48th anniversary. We thank you for improving the lives of so many and for helping America be a good neighbor to those in need. Your country is grateful for your service. Your country is grateful for the good will and the seeds of peace you have sown or are sowing. Your country is grateful for your contributions to the safety and long-term security of our Nation. Your efforts and the efforts of other volunteers are needed now more than ever. I will continue to work in supporting your important missions and expanding your ranks.

I can't stress enough the importance of our Smart Power initiatives and the importance of investing in efforts such as the Peace Corps. I am very glad to see the Obama administration, particularly Secretary of State Clinton, our former colleague, giving these initiatives an important public boost. And more important, I would say to young people and old—the young people who work with us here and any who may be listening in—that this is a wonderful opportunity to make a significant contribution to other countries, to the cause of peace in the world, and to provide yourself with an education you cannot get in any institution.

I look forward to partnering with the new administration and will work with those and others in Congress to lead the effort to make Smart Power initiatives a cornerstone in our foreign policy and in our efforts to combat extremism and terrorism around the world.

#### PRESIDENT OBAMA'S FIRST BUDGET

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today our President sent his budget to the Hill. On Tuesday night, in a joint address, our new President, with his usual eloquence, sketched out his fiscal policy goals.

First off, as ranking Republican on the Finance Committee—and I am a senior Budget Committee member—I wish to point out that Republicans were happy to hear the President make deficit reduction a very high priority. If I heard correctly, the loudest bipartisan applause, in terms of responses to the President's policy proposals, greeted that policy point. We Republicans want deficit reduction on our future fiscal path. As we come out of the recession—hopefully sooner rather than later—we need to get the deficit down.

While we Republicans agree with the President on that goal, we disagree on the degree to which the Democratic leadership has dramatically expanded the deficit and added to the debt. A couple of weeks ago, Republicans and Democrats disagreed on what is referred to as a stimulus bill. In both bodies, only three Republican Members supported that conference report. We parted ways on the stimulus bill for many reasons. Most on our side disagreed that we should put \$1 trillion of