

private sector to borrow money, or we have to tax the private sector, thereby reducing the private sector's ability to create jobs in the future. The bottom line, as this editorial notes:

Almost everything Congress has done in recent months has made private businesses less inclined to hire new workers.

That problem is exacerbated by the bill which we take up tomorrow. This is the so-called jobs bill. It is a bill which will cost \$116 billion. It will add \$54 billion to our national debt. It will further weaken the private sector's ability to create jobs.

As this Wall Street Journal editorial notes:

It's too bad we can't do the Census every year, because maybe the U.S. economy would then show some job growth.

That is being facetious, obviously. Those are not the kind of jobs that will productively create economic growth, because they are not in the private sector. They are simply temporary. I hope as we debate the bill over the course of the next several days, the so-called stimulus, we can get away from this notion that somehow or other if we take money out of the productive part of our economy and have the government spend it, that somehow or other, magically, that is going to help engineer economic recovery. It doesn't. Instead what we have is an economic recovery that is exceedingly slow and will be more so, the more regulation and taxation we impose on our private sector.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 4, 2010]
EMPLOYERS ON STRIKE

It's too bad we can't do the Census every year, because maybe the U.S. economy would then show some jobs growth. That quip was one of the rueful asides we heard yesterday as Americans learned that the economy created a net total of 431,000 new jobs in May, including 411,000 temporary Census hires.

The private economy—that is, the wealth creation part, not the wealth redistribution part—gained only 41,000 jobs, down sharply from the encouraging 218,000 in April, and 158,000 in March. The unemployment rate did fall to 9.7% from 9.9%, but that was mainly because the labor force contracted by 322,000. Millions of Americans, beyond the 15 million Americans officially counted as unemployed, have given up looking for work.

Worst of all, nearly half of all unemployed workers in America today (a record 46%) have been out of work for six months or more. Normally job growth accelerates during the early stages of an economic rebound, but this dismal report suggests that the recovery remains well short of becoming a typical expansion.

There were some slivers of good news in the May jobs report. For those who have jobs, the average work week rose by 0.1 hours to 34.2 hours and earnings nudged upward by 0.3%. Manufacturers added 29,000 workers, and their hours worked jumped 5.1%, the best since 1983.

Perhaps this is what White House chief economist Christina Romer was looking at yesterday when she cited "encouraging developments" in the jobs market and "continuing signs of labor market recovery." We doubt this was the private reaction in the Oval Office, whose occupant was told by Ms. Romer and economic co-religionist Jared

Bernstein that the February 2009 stimulus would kick start a recovery in growth and jobs. Whatever happened to the great neo-Keynesian "multiplier," in which \$1 in government spending was supposed to produce 1.5 times that in economic output?

Imagine if Ms. Romer had instead promised in 2009 that Congress could spend nearly \$1 trillion, and 16 months later the unemployment rate would be nearly 10% and that more than 2.5 million additional Americans would be without jobs. Would Congress have still spent the cash? Well, sure, Congress will always spend what it can get away with, but the American public would have turned against the stimulus even faster than it has.

The multiplier is an illusion because that Keynesian \$1 has to come from somewhere in the private economy, either in higher taxes or borrowing. Its net economic impact was probably negative because so much of the stimulus was handed out in transfer payments (jobless benefits, Medicaid expansions, welfare) that did nothing to change incentives to invest or take risks. Meanwhile, that \$862 billion was taken out of the more productive private economy.

Almost everything Congress has done in recent months has made private businesses less inclined to hire new workers. ObamaCare imposes new taxes and mandates on private employers. Even with record unemployment, Congress raised the minimum wage to \$7.25, pricing more workers out of jobs. The teen unemployment rate rose to 26.4% in May, and for those between the ages of 25 and 34 it rose to 10.5%. These should be some of the first to be hired in an expansion because they are relatively cheap and have the potential for large productivity gains as they add skills.

The "jobs" bill that the House passed last week expands jobless insurance to 99 weeks, while raising taxes by \$80 billion on small employers and U.S.-based corporations. On January 1, Congress is set to let taxes rise on capital gains, dividends and small businesses. None of these are incentives to hire more Americans.

Ms. Romer said yesterday that to "ensure a more rapid, widespread recovery," the White House supports "tax incentives for clean energy," and "extensions of unemployment insurance and other key income support programs, a fund to encourage small business lending, and fiscal relief for state and local governments." Hello? This is the failed 2009 stimulus in miniature.

It's always a mistake to read too much into one month's jobs data, and we still think the recovery will lumber on. But if Ms. Romer wants this to be more than a jobless recovery, she and her boss should drop their government-creates-wealth illusions and start asking why so many private employers remain on strike.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Arizona. There is no one more thoughtful on finance matters and job creation than he. He has made a very important point. It was a well-intentioned effort by the administration to say: We have an economic recession so we need to stimulate the economy through some government spending. There were proposals on the Republican side to do that to a much lesser extent. But what has happened is, as the Senator has pointed out, the focus has been much too heavily on creating more government jobs, when what we need is an environment for job growth in the private

sector. In fact, as the Senator from Arizona pointed out, the actions the government has taken over the last year during this great recession too often make it harder to create jobs in the private sector.

The health care bill taxes job creators and investors. Those are the ones who create the jobs. The stimulus package runs up the debt. The higher the debt goes, the more money it sucks out of the system, and the harder it is to get money and to create jobs. The financial regulation bill makes credit harder to get on Main Street, as we now see it going through the Congress. If you can't get credit, you can't create a job.

Jobs are at the front of everyone's mind. Our friend, the former Governor from Virginia, is here. He knows this very well. The Governor of Tennessee, Phil Bredesen, said the other day that in my State, if he had 100 conversations, 95 would be about jobs. I agree. But clearly a fundamental difference of opinion we seem to have in the Senate is our focus on creating an environment for job growth in the private sector. The Democratic focus seems to me to be much more focused on creating more government jobs. That is not working. Because if the economy continues to grow for the rest of the year at approximately the rate it has grown for the first part of the year, we will end the year with 10 percent unemployment. As we all know, that burden falls most heavily on lower income Americans.

OILSPILL RESPONSE

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I rise to speak on what I call an oilspill response for grownups. The tragic gulf oilspill has produced overreaction, demagoguery, and bad policy. I would cite "Obama's Katrina, end offshore drilling, produce 20 percent of our electricity from windmills" as three examples of overreaction, demagoguery, and bad policy. None of these options helps clean up and move forward a country using 25 percent of the world's energy, as the United States does year-in and year-out.

If we Americans want both clean energy and a high standard of living, then here are 10 steps for thoughtful grownups:

No. 1, figure out what went wrong and make it unlikely to happen again. We do not stop flying after a terrible airplane crash, and we are not going to stop drilling offshore after this terrible spill. Thirty percent of U.S. oil production and 25 percent of our natural gas production come from thousands of active wells in the Gulf of Mexico. Without it, gasoline prices would skyrocket, and we would depend more on tankers from the Middle East with worse safety records than American offshore drillers.

No. 2, learn a safety lesson from the U.S. nuclear industry. That lesson is accountability. For 60 years, reactors

on U.S. Navy ships have operated without killing one sailor. Why? The career of a ship's commander can be ended by one mistake. Incidentally, the number of deaths from nuclear accidents at U.S. commercial reactors is also zero.

No. 3, what was the President's cleanup plan and where were the people and equipment to implement it? In 1990, after the Exxon Valdez spill, a new law passed by Congress required that the President "ensure" the cleanup of a spill and have the people and equipment to do it. That is what the law has said since 1990. President Obama effectively delegated this job to the spiller, BP. Is that the President's only real option today? If so, what should future Presidents have on hand for backup if the spiller of oil cannot perform?

No. 4, put back on the table more onshore resources for oil and natural gas. Drilling in a few thousand acres along the edge of the 19 million-acre Alaska National Wildlife Refuge and at other onshore locations would produce vast oil supplies. A spill on land could be contained much more easily than 1 mile deep in water.

No. 5, electrify half our cars and trucks. This is an ambitious goal, but it is the single best way to reduce U.S. oil consumption. Electrifying half our cars and trucks could cut our oil consumption by about one-third, to about 13 million barrels of petroleum product a day. A Brookings Institution study says we can electrify half our cars and trucks without building one single new powerplant if we plug in our cars at night. Last week, Senator DORGAN, Senator MERKLEY, and I introduced legislation to jump-start America's effort to electrify half our cars and trucks. This is a subject about which Republicans and Democrats in the Senate agree.

No. 6, invest in energy research and development. This is another subject about which Republicans and Democrats in the Senate agree. A cost-competitive 500-mile battery would virtually guarantee eventual electrification of half our cars and trucks. While we are at it, reducing the cost of solar power by a factor of 4 would be a good response to a clean energy challenge, as would finding a way for utilities to actually make money from the CO₂ their coal plants produce.

No. 7, stop pretending wind power has anything to do with reducing America's dependence on oil. Windmills generate electricity, not transportation fuel. Wind has become the energy pet rock of the 21st century, as well as a taxpayer ripoff. According to the Energy Information Administration, wind produces only 1.3 percent of U.S. electricity but receives Federal taxpayer subsidies 25 times as much per megawatt hour as subsidies for all other forms of electricity production combined. Wind can be a useful energy supplement, but it has nothing to do with ending our dependence on oil.

No. 8, if we need more green electricity, build nuclear plants. This is

another subject upon which Republicans and Democrats agree. The 100 commercial nuclear plants we already have produce 70 percent of our pollution-free, carbon-free electricity. Yet the United States has not broken ground on a new reactor in 30 years, while China starts one every 3 months and France is 80 percent nuclear. We would not put our nuclear navy in mothballs if we were going to war. We should not put our nuclear plants in mothballs if we want low-cost, reliable green energy.

Finally, Nos. 9 and 10.

No. 9, focus on conservation. In the region where I live, the Tennessee Valley Authority could close four of its dirtiest coal plants if we residents of the TVA region reduced our per capita use of electricity just to the national average.

No. 10, make sure liability limits are appropriate for spill damage. The Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund, funded by a per-barrel fee on industry, should be adjusted to pay for cleanup and to compensate those hurt by spills. An industry insurance program like that of the nuclear industry is also an attractive model to consider.

So I offer this afternoon these 10 grownup steps—grownup steps forward that could help turn a tragic event into a stronger America.

I thank the Acting President pro tempore and yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, are we in morning business?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes.

OILSPILL CLOSES IN

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, my worst fears are coming true. The wind that had so blessed us in our State of Florida for going on 7 weeks now shifted a few days ago, and this big spill of oil is moving to the east and to the northeast, and it is closing in on the gulf coast, the northwest gulf coast of Florida.

Thus far, most of the more concentrated oil is well off shore. Under the command of the Coast Guard, there are skimmers 25 to 50 miles out from the coast that have a boom that goes out from a fairly decently sized ship that then scoops up that oil into a concentrated area. Then they have what is kind of like a vacuum pump. It is almost like a vacuum cleaner. It sits and floats on top of the water, on top of the oil, and it sucks it up into a pipe, and that goes into a tank or a rubber bladder on top of the ship. Thus far, they

have been able to take care of a good bit of that oil.

Of course, that is the strategy—to keep the oil offshore; don't let it get to shore because when it does, it messes up your beach and, even worse, it messes up the wetlands. As a matter of fact, when oil gets into wetlands, into marsh grass, into mangroves, you have a problem. More than likely, it is going to take a while for that marsh grass to come back. Mangroves and oil do not mix. Of course, then we are talking about these unique estuaries that spawn so much of our marine life in the Gulf of Mexico. So what we have is a nightmare that potentially is coming to reality.

There are a lot of people who are working awfully hard. The Coast Guard is working hard, but right now the Coast Guard is stretched to the limit. There are only so many Coastguardsmen. They still have to do all the things the Coast Guard has to do all over the world, including the gulf coast. They still have to do rescue. They still have to do search missions. Down in south Florida, we still have to have the Coast Guard there going after the drug runners. So there is a limited amount we can have. As good as those men and women are, they are stretched to the limit. They are going around the clock.

As the oil continues to gush, this problem is going to become more and more acute. It could become acute in a number of ways. We are being told—and I can certainly say this Senator has become a skeptic about what is correct information. Remember when we were told it was only 1,000 barrels of oil a day that was gushing into the gulf? A couple of weeks later, that was revised to 5,000 barrels of oil a day, and then that was revised to 12,000, but the report was omitted that said it could be as high as 25,000.

Now we are told that this attempt called the top hat; that is, an attempt to put a cap on the top of that blowout preventer where they cut off the riser pipe, and the oil is going up to the surface to a tanker—they are saying that is now 10,000 barrels a day, but look at the live video and see how much of it is still gushing outside of that top hat.

So how much is going into the gulf? Well, if it is 25,000 barrels a day, if that is the accurate figure, there is still 15,000 barrels of oil a day going into the gulf. And if it keeps going—and the Coast Guard admiral said yesterday it is going to go until September, until they can get the relief wells down and try to plug it with cement down near the oil reservoir, which is some 18,000 feet below the seabed. If it keeps gushing that amount all the way to September, it will be close to the largest oilspill there has ever been on planet Earth in the sea, which was the Ixtoc in the Bay of Campeche spill that spewed for 10 months. By the way, it was only in 150 feet of water, and they couldn't get it stopped. This is in 5,000 feet of water.