

than \$3 million from the Consumer Product Safety Commission.

So we have this new law in effect that can literally save children's lives and make children more healthy and help their brain development, in effect, in Eugene, OR, and Columbus, OH, but if we cut back on the enforcement of these laws by cutting these agencies and taking away employees who inspect these, who force these companies—who make sure these companies are doing the right thing and not selling lead-based toys to American children, what have we? And that is really unfortunate. The cuts would take us back to the very reason Congress passed and President Bush—a Republican President—in those days signed into law the Consumer Product Safety Improvement Act in the first place.

We know there are plenty of government regulations that we should reexamine and in some cases pull back or reform or repeal, but it just seems my conservative colleagues don't know the difference between regulations that might actually affect jobs and regulations that clearly protect the public health and clearly protect the public safety.

We know the Senate will prepare to debate the fiscal year 2012 financial services and general government appropriations bill later this week. I call on my colleagues to support funding for the Consumer Product Safety Commission. We know what that does. We know it saves lives. We know it makes a difference in the lives of our children.

VICTOR F. STEWART, JR.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. President, I rise on a more somber note. A longtime friend of mine, Victor F. Stewart, Jr., from O'Leary, OH, died this week at the age of 85. He was a counselor to me, he was a teacher, and he was a friend. He was someone who mentored me and so many other people in our county and our State. He dedicated his life to his community and to his country. He leaves behind 10 children and family and friends. He leaves public servants behind him whom he counseled about life, politics, and public service.

Vic was a child of the Great Depression. He was born in the 1920s. He was a child of the New Deal. He believed in loyalty and frugality. He believed in a citizen's responsibility to vote and to be a citizen.

As I said, he was the father of 10—6 daughters and 4 sons. His wife Helen survives him, and he was married to her for 62 years. I remember going to Vic and Helen's 50th wedding anniversary and the number of children and grandchildren and friends in the community, and the love people felt and extended to both him and Helen was a sight to see.

Vic was a city councilman. He was mayor of O'Leary. He served in the U.S. Army in World War II. He was always a team player. He was a Catholic Youth League basketball coach, a Lit-

tle League coach, a high school third baseman, and, again, a mentor to young people in politics, baseball, sporting activities, and especially to his children.

He was a Democratic Party chair in Lorain County for many years. He walked and met with President Kennedy, President Johnson, and President Carter when they were in Lorain County. He credits President Johnson with so much of what we all should credit our government for doing: the Civil Rights Act, the Voting Rights Act, the passage of Medicare, the antipoverty initiatives of the Johnson Great Society program.

When I think about what our government can do in partnership with the private sector, that is what brought us Medicare, that is what brought us safe drinking water, that is what brought us civil rights, and that is what brought us Head Start, many of them passing in the mid-1960s, passage of legislation from which our country still benefits.

Many of the young people sitting in front of us today will benefit from the Pell grants that came out of the Higher Education Act. Senator WHITEHOUSE spoke to a group of us today about a forum he did at the University of Rhode Island and what those Pell grants mean to some of the professors there who were able to go to college because of the Pell grants, some of the young students there who can afford college because of the Pell grants, and some older people who went back to school because of these Pell grants and got an opportunity to further their education as middle-aged parents. Vic Stewart was part of all that.

Vic Stewart believed that the role of government in our communities could make a difference in people's lives, especially working families. So while he met with President Carter and President Kennedy and President Johnson, his heart was always in the community. He cared most about working families, poor kids who didn't have the opportunities of some more privileged people in O'Leary or Lorain or anywhere else in our county. That is what I admired about Vic.

I was so appreciative of the wisdom he would impart to me when we would get together several times a year at breakfast or lunch and just talk about what I was doing and what he was doing, and he was always so helpful that way. He offered his no-nonsense advice with a touch of humor and compassion and a healthy dose of common sense.

He understood the value of a hard day's work. He lived his life guided by that devotion to God. He was a devout Roman Catholic. To family—he was a terrific father and husband to Helen. Friends—he counted so many of us as people who were close to him and his love of country. We will never forget his warmth and his wit and his wisdom.

He always looked to the whole community, not just the privileged. He was

sickened by this power of Wall Street and this huge executive compensation, these huge salaries and bonuses that too many in our society on Wall Street and other places have taken.

His heart was always with the middle class, working families. He taught integrity, especially to young people. That is why I owe Vic Stewart so much. We have lost a true friend, we have lost a teacher, and we have lost a mentor who made a difference in the lives of so many of us. We mourn for Vic Stewart, Jr. We think of Helen. We think of the sons and daughters whom Vic and Helen have taught so well and raised so well over the last five-plus decades.

Mr. President, I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNET). Without objection, it is so ordered.

REBUILD AMERICA JOBS ACT

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, if we pass the Rebuild America Jobs Act, we will immediately invest \$50 billion into our transportation infrastructure and generate hundreds of thousands of good jobs and establish a national infrastructure bank which will generate even more good jobs. We need these jobs during the current period of high unemployment, and upgrading our crumbling infrastructure will spur long-term job growth in addition to the immediate employment benefits. So I strongly support this bill and I hope our colleagues can be brought around as well.

The Rebuild America Jobs Act is one piece of the larger American Jobs Act which, when Leader REID brought it to the floor, all 47 Senate Republicans chose to filibuster instead of allowing us to begin debating and, if they wished, improving the jobs legislation. That filibuster blocked President Obama's plan to cut payroll taxes for every single American worker, and it blocked his plan to offer business owners generous tax breaks to hire new workers and grow their businesses. Economists estimated that the American Jobs Act would create nearly 2 million jobs—1.9 million jobs. Perhaps for that reason, many pieces of the bill have received wide bipartisan support in the past. Indeed, just last December, similar job-creating provisions were included in the Job Creation and Tax Cuts Act, which received 81 votes in the Senate.

The jobs bill that Republicans blocked was fully paid for through a 5.6-percent surtax on income in excess of \$1 million. In other words, the only tax increase in the bill is a provision that pays for job creation in this country by

having millionaires and billionaires who continue to enjoy the record low tax rates brought on by the Bush tax cuts pay a little more and only on their income over \$1 million. There is no increase on the first million.

A recent study by Citizens for Tax Justice showed that the surcharge would only apply to the richest one-fifth of 1 percent of U.S. taxpayers, leaving the taxes of more than 99 percent of all Americans—if my math is right, 99.8 percent of all Americans—unchanged.

The Rebuild America Jobs Act, which is one piece of the full jobs bill, is paid for with a much smaller 0.7-percent surtax on income above \$1 million. Having one-fifth of 1 percent of the wealthiest Americans pay less than 1 percent more in income taxes, and only on income above \$1 million of income, hardly seems unreasonable to support hundreds of thousands of jobs for middle-class families in this economic climate.

As we try again and again to advance jobs legislation in the Senate, the supercommittee we established in the Budget Control Act is at work on recommendations to cut the deficit. Getting the most fortunate and well-compensated Americans to start paying a fair share in taxes ought to be a logical component of any deficit reduction plan—at least under a theory that we should have a progressive Federal tax system. That is a tax system in which we pay higher rates of tax the more money we earn.

In theory, we have a progressive Federal tax system, but, in fact, do we? We are often told that the wealthiest Americans are already shouldering too great a share of our tax burden. Earlier this year, one of the candidates, a leading candidate for the Republican Presidential nomination, told NBC that “the top 1 percent of income earners pay about 40 percent of all taxes into the Federal Government.”

That sounds like a lot—the top 1 percent pay 40 percent of all taxes. Let's look at some data to see if the theory proves correct. The Urban Institute and the Brookings Institution, two very respected organizations, estimate that the total share of Federal taxes paid by the top 1 percent of taxpayers is, in fact, 22.7 percent—not 40 percent. Remember that for a moment, 22.7 percent is the amount of Federal taxes the top 1 percent of income earners pay.

If we take a look at the long-term trends in income and taxation, it is revealing. According to the Congressional Budget Office, between 1979 and 2006, the total effective Federal tax rate for the top 1 percent of households fell. The tax rate went down almost 6 points, from 37 percent to 31.2 percent. Over the same period, that group, the top 1 percent, went from earning 10 percent of the Nation's income to 22.8 percent. The amount of the Nation's income that the richest 1 percent earn in this country climbed over that period from 10 to nearly 23 percent. They

claimed an additional 13 percent of the Nation's income.

Go back to the number. The Urban Institute and Brookings Institution estimate that the total share of Federal taxes paid by the top 1 percent of taxpayers is 22.7 percent, but the share of income the top 1 percent takes is 22.8 percent. That is not a progressive tax system. They may be paying a lot in taxes, but it is proportionate almost exactly to what they are taking out of the economy in income. The relative burden of the extremely wealthy in this country is going steadily down, not up, and it has just crossed to the point where it is no longer progressive.

There is a tale of two buildings that may help explain why. This is the first of the two buildings. This is the Helmsley Building in New York City. It is on Park Avenue. It is a lovely, wonderful place—a great building. Not surprisingly, some very successful and well-compensated people live there.

It is also a big building. It is so big it has its own ZIP Code. Because it has its own ZIP Code and because the Internal Revenue Service calculates and provides information about income by ZIP Code, we can learn quite a lot about the occupants of this wonderful building. What we know from the latest IRS information that I have been able to find is that the very well-compensated and successful individuals and corporations that call this building home actually paid a 14.7-percent tax rate in 2007. That rate is lower than the Bureau of Labor Statistics tells us is what the average New York City janitor or doorman or security guard pays. So at least in this building the fabulously successful and well-compensated occupants of the building who live in those wonderful apartments on Park Avenue are paying a significantly lower tax rate in real life than the actual men and women who are their janitors, who are their doormen, who are their security guards.

It is not just some fluke about the Helmsley Building. We all remember Leona Helmsley saying it is the little people who pay taxes. There is no ghost of Leona Helmsley making that true in this building; it is true across the board. Each year, the Internal Revenue Service publishes a report consolidating the tax returns of the highest income 400 Americans and they publish that data. They do not get around to it very quickly, but in May they published the most recent data on the top 400 taxpayers in America for 2008. In 2008, the top 400 earners took home an average of \$270 million each. They earned more than one-quarter of a billion dollars each that year, which is wonderful. That is the kind of country we are. One can make a real fortune here. But where it gets a little sketchy is that, on average, those 400 extremely highly compensated Americans actually paid into the Treasury of the United States at an average Federal tax rate of just 18.2 percent on adjusted gross income—18.2 percent.

We have spent time on the Senate floor debating whether the top income tax rate should be 35 percent or 39.6 percent. That is not what they pay. The top 400 income earners, the \$¼ billion-a-year crowd, pay actually, on average, just 18.2 percent. This means the 400 highest earning individuals in the Nation, in 2008, just like the occupants of this Helmsley Building, were paying rates lower than or equivalent to what regular working families pay.

If we went back to the Bureau of Labor Statistics and pulled out the information for the Helmsley Building but about the janitors, the doormen and about the security guards and we look to see who else in America is paying an 18.2-percent tax rate—if a person is a single filer they are paying an 18.2-percent tax rate in this country if they make \$39,350 a year. Where I come from in Rhode Island, the Bureau of Labor Statistics says that is about what a truck driver makes—\$40,200 is what a truck driver makes; \$39,350 is what it takes to put a person in the income bracket where they are paying the same tax rate into our Treasury as the 400 members of the \$¼ billion-a-year club.

The choice is very clear. Instead of moving forward on a jobs plan that independent economists agree will create millions of American jobs in the near term, we are facing an opposition that is fighting to make sure people making \$¼ billion a year pay lower Federal tax rates than regular working, middle-class American families.

That is the story of the first building, the Helmsley Plaza. This is a different building. This is the Uglad building. It is called Uglad House. It doesn't look like much, but it is near the lovely aquamarine beaches of the Cayman Islands. What is interesting about this little building is that 18,000 corporations claim they are doing business here. That is not a very big building. The notion that 18,000 corporations are doing business out of this building—that gives a whole new meaning to the phrase “small business.” But there is no real business going on here. The business that is going on here is funny business, under the Tax Code.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We have a 10-minute time limit and the Senator has consumed 9 minutes.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I ask consent for 3 more minutes.

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

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. The companies doing business here are not real companies; they are phony-baloney shell corporations that are designed to hide assets and to play games with the tax system. This income never even makes it into the 18.2 percent of the Helmsley Building. This gets hidden away completely.

When our tax system is rigged so it permits billionaires to pay lower tax rates than truck drivers and allows the wealthiest to avoid taxes by hiding assets in phony offshore corporations,

something is not right. With multitrillion dollar budget deficits threatening our Nation's prosperity, we have to do something to make our tax system more fair for regular Americans.

I have been working on legislation which would ensure that millionaires and billionaires pay an effective tax rate at least as high as is paid by middle-class families. This would require all taxpayers with income over \$1 million a year, indexed to inflation, to pay at least a 25-percent rate. A 25-percent rate is the marginal rate middle-class taxpayers currently pay on income, from about \$34,000 of income to about \$84,000 of income, depending on the size of the family and the deductions they get. It seems fair to me to ask people at the highest end of the income spectrum to pay at least the tax rate middle-class families in the \$34,000-to-\$84,000 range actually pay. It simply doesn't make sense to have the wealthiest abusing these tax gimmicks to pay lower tax rates than middle-class families. So whether it is Leader REID's surtax or my proposal, I hope we can act to ensure that the most successful Americans actually pay their fair share of our national tax burden to restore our Nation to its economic strength.

I thank my distinguished colleague from Michigan for her courtesy.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, first, I wish to thank my good friend and colleague from Rhode Island for his important words on the floor and for indicating that millions and millions of middle-class families and small businesses in this country expect us to figure out a way to make sure the tax system is fair and we have the opportunity for everyone to be able to be successful in this country and know they have a fair chance to make it and that the rules are not rigged for just a few folks. So I wish to thank the distinguished Senator for his comments and for his leadership and pointing out some very important things for the majority of Americans and small businesses across the country.

I rise to speak about a very important issue that will be coming before us for a vote that directly relates to jobs. As the Chair knows, that is a pretty big issue for me in Michigan. We have over 11 percent unemployment. I am laser focused on creating jobs and growing the economy because I think it is absolutely critical for us to get out of debt. We are not going to get out of debt with more than 14 million people out of work, and we are not going to be able to move forward in a way that allows families and businesses to succeed in America if we are not able to turn this economy around and create jobs.

Following World War II, our country created a system of roads and bridges and railways and airports unlike any in the world. In fact, countries are now

looking to duplicate what we have done. In the decades that followed, this important infrastructure served as the foundation of our economic growth and prosperity, being able to move commerce and people from one place to another, and we grew. Now that infrastructure has fallen into disrepair. Not surprisingly, we need to be doing some things to be able to rebuild and make sure our bridges are safe and to be able to move forward in a global economy and have the ability to compete because we have an infrastructure that is worthy of the 21st century.

More than one-quarter of our Nation's bridges are either structurally deficient or obsolete. Think about that, one out of four. If I am driving down the road, I don't think I want to bet that one-out-of-four probability that the bridge I am driving over with my children or my two beautiful grandchildren is safe. I think families want to know every bridge is safe, every road is safe, and that they are not going to put their families in jeopardy as they are driving on our roads and crossing our bridges.

In Michigan, we have 1,400 bridges that are deficient—more than 13 percent of Michigan's bridges. Motorists in Michigan are no stranger to bad roads. I can tell you as somebody who has the wonderful honor of representing Michigan, a very large State, I spend much time on the road, as do my brothers in their work, and my family is on the road as well. We can tell you every year the freezing and thawing wreaks havoc on our roads and every year our roads are full of potholes. I certainly can speak from experience about the expense of fixing a car when one drives over and falls into one of those big potholes.

Even our Republican Governor, Rick Snyder, says we need to invest in infrastructure. He recently said:

Michigan's infrastructure is living on borrowed time. We must reinvest in it if we are to successfully reinvent our economy.

I couldn't agree more. I wish to commend the Governor for those words and for his focus and his administration's focus on investing in our roads and our infrastructure.

We are sitting in traffic and paying the price at the pump because we have fallen behind in maintaining and improving our physical infrastructure as a country to be able to move across town or across the State or across the country. If we don't invest to fix our crumbling roads and bridges and airports now, the costs will only go up, as we know. Failure to act now will cost nearly 1 million Americans their jobs. Those are a lot of people. Those are a lot of families. Those are a lot of mortgages. Those are a lot of families figuring out whether they are going to be able to put food on the table and send their kids to college. There are 1 million American jobs in jeopardy. It will cost our economy nearly \$1 trillion over the next 10 years if we do not act. We have the opportunity to act and we

have the opportunity to act right now. We can invest in rebuilding our infrastructure and it will, in turn, rebuild our economy and create jobs.

The Rebuild America Jobs Act is an opportunity to turn the corner and to head in the right direction. Not only will it upgrade 150,000 miles of roadway, improve thousands of miles of train track, and modernize our Nation's runways and air traffic control systems, but it will also put hundreds of thousands of people to work. This is a win-win. The Rebuild America Jobs Act will provide desperately needed repair funds and will provide the seed money for a national infrastructure bank that will attract private sector capital to help fund a broad range of new investments. This is such an important idea to be able to provide seed money, to be able to track the private sector, private capital, to be able to invest, to be able to leverage the dollars that American taxpayers put in and be able to address all our roads and bridges and other infrastructure needs in a way that creates jobs.

It will have a very big impact on my great State of Michigan. The plan will make immediate investments in Michigan that could support at least 11,700 local jobs that are so critical to us right now as we are coming out of this huge jobs deficit hole we have been in for too long. The plan to rebuild our infrastructure and put Americans back to work has bipartisan as well as strong support from the private sector. The presidents of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the Republican Mayors and Local Officials Coalition have both supported the infrastructure investments we are talking about. This approach has strong bipartisan support.

Simply put, the Rebuild America Jobs Act will fix our crumbling infrastructure, put hundreds of thousands of people back to work at the same time. It will not add a dime to our deficit, and the American people support it. So this is a win-win. Why will it not add a dime to our deficit? Because we pay for it in a way that I think is very reasonable and very fair. We are asking those who are most blessed economically in our country, those who earn over \$1 million a year, to pay less than 1 percent, .7 percent, on any \$1 they earn above the first \$1 million of income. So they would be asked to have basically a surcharge to contribute to creating jobs and investing in the future of America, rebuilding America—jobs that cannot go overseas, jobs in rebuilding America.

This can be done for less than a 1-percent surcharge, not on the first \$1 million they earn but on the \$1 that comes after or the \$2 or the \$5 or the \$10 or the second million. It is anything above \$1 million where we are asking those in our country who are in a position to be able to help instead of going back to middle-class families, working families, senior citizens, people who have been hurt so hard in this recession for so long. Instead of asking them

one more time to be the ones to carry the burden, we are, instead, asking those who have had success, who have been blessed financially, and who have benefited from this great country, whether it was with what was done to support Wall Street, whether it was other ways in this country, for them to be a part of the solution with less than 1 percent on any dollars earned above \$1 million. I think this is a reasonable and fair approach.

This is about jobs. We are talking about the Rebuild America Jobs Act, putting people back to work, doing something that is incredibly important for our country and will grow the economy, create jobs, rebuild communities, and help our country move forward.

I urge my colleagues, when we have the vote, to move forward on this bill and that we all join in what has been a bipartisan set of issues of infrastructure investment and rebuilding America. I hope we will see that in the vote that that will be coming in the next couple days.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. I thank and commend my distinguished colleague from Michigan for those very eloquent remarks on behalf of an act that I too rise to support. I thank the Presiding Officer for his very eloquent and persuasive comments earlier in this debate on the Rebuild America Jobs Act and the need for this Nation to focus on the increasing trend in inequality and a very troubling absence of focus on the compelling obligation we have to rebuild America at this point in our history, to rebuild our roads and bridges and ports and airports and schools.

The Rebuild America Jobs Act would provide \$50 billion very directly to rebuilding our roads and bridges and railroads and airports, and that is a pressing need for America, but equally as pressing and important are the people hurting and struggling all across the country. People are struggling to find jobs, to stay in their homes, to keep their families together, and those struggles ought to be heard and seen in this Chamber, on this floor, at this moment in our history. They are Americans who played by the rules and who are now out of work, out of support, and soon, sadly, out of hope.

For much of our time recently, we have been mired in the politics of deficit and debt, and that is not to say those subjects are unimportant. I believe in fiscal responsibility. I believe in cutting our debt, restraining spending, and cutting the deficit. But deficit cutting cannot be used as an excuse to gut the social safety net we have labored hard to create over 75 years. It cannot be used to ignore the needs of people struggling to find work. It cannot be used as a reason to neglect our critical infrastructure in this country and the sad and serious defects we now find in it.

One powerful and proven means to cut the deficit and the debt is to create jobs and enable economic recovery. What matters most to the American people now is jobs, work, employment, going back to work, back to good jobs, earning a living for the sake of not only their economic well-being but their respect and self-worth, their dignity. More is at stake here than simply a paycheck. It is the social fabric of our communities, our country, our families. That is why it ought to be a priority. Right now, investing in infrastructure in those roads and bridges and ports and airports is one of the most immediate job creators available.

The Congressional Budget Office has found that returning to full employment would reduce the deficit by 25 percent. That is way more than the politically charged and severely damaging cuts offered by many of my colleagues across the aisle. Thankfully, we have a plan to put us on the path to full employment, and it is called the Rebuild America Jobs Act. This bill would put America back to work immediately by rebuilding our ailing infrastructure.

There is no question about the need. The American Society of Civil Engineers recently rated America's infrastructure and they gave us a D. According to the nonpartisan organization Transportation For America, Fairfield County in my home State of Connecticut has the fourth highest number of motorists using structurally deficient bridges among all the metropolitan areas nationwide. That is an indictment not of Connecticut but of our Nation, and so is the fact that over 9 percent of Connecticut's bridges are considered structurally deficient. Nationwide, in fact, the numbers are even worse. One in four of our Nation's bridges is either structurally deficient or obsolete. No one wants another tragedy such as the one we experienced in Connecticut. It is called the Mianus River Bridge collapse. It killed three people. It paralyzed the roadways in and around the bridge for months.

It cost millions of dollars. It led to litigation that spanned years. The bridge's collapse almost 30 years ago prompted a major infrastructure effort in Connecticut focusing on repair and reconstruction to make our bridges and roads more safe and secure. We need not await the kinds of tragedies we saw 30 years ago in Connecticut and more recently in other States involving bridge collapses and other tragedies that show the deficiencies and unacceptable defects in these roads and bridges.

The need is clear. At a time when civil engineers across the country are calling for vast improvements in our national infrastructure, the measure before this body would accomplish exactly that goal. It would provide aid for States to be spent at their discretion and flexibility as to the projects but not as to the purpose. The purpose would be roads, bridges, airports, railroads.

This bill would invest \$50 billion in upgrading and repairing 150,000 miles of road, laying or maintaining 4,000 miles of train tracks, and restoring 150 miles of runways at our Nation's airports. It would also provide seed money—and this purpose is important—for a national infrastructure bank that will attract private sector capital to fund a broad range of nationally significant projects, going beyond the ones that would be immediately supported by the \$50 billion in this measure. That national infrastructure bank would be capitalized at \$10 billion, but it would attract money from private investors to do far more than would be enabled by the initial seed money.

This is a bipartisan measure, long supported by Senators KERRY and HUTCHISON. I am proud to have joined them as a cosponsor, and I thank them for their leadership. I thank Members on the House side, including my colleague, Congresswoman ROSA DELAUNO, for supporting this measure over the years.

A national infrastructure bank would leverage private capital and public capital to fund a broad range of nationally significant infrastructure projects all around the country—in Connecticut and elsewhere. These funds would provide an immediate boost for our economy. It is estimated, in fact, that for every \$1 spent on these roads, bridges, and other infrastructure projects, our gross domestic product would be increased by about \$1.59—for every \$1, an increase of \$1.59 in gross domestic product. We are talking about investment. We are talking about investment in America's future, in Connecticut's present as well as its future, because people in Connecticut would go back to work, back to jobs, back to livelihoods that give them dignity and self-respect.

With so many people out of work and a dire need for that kind of investment, common sense says we ought to pass this bill, we ought to do it now, without delay, and we ought to do it on a bipartisan basis. There is nothing Republican or Democratic about investment in roads or bridges or airports or railroads to make them safer, more secure, more efficient.

I ask my colleagues, regardless of party, to stand with us and millions of Americans who are out of work, to come together and find a way to pass the Rebuild America Jobs Act. Let's pass this bill now. Let's do it together, without any more delay. People are continuing to struggle and seek work, and this bill is the right thing for America. It is the right thing for Connecticut. Let's do it now.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, I wish to speak about the recent trade votes that the U.S. Senate had over the last several weeks. I believe that bilateral trade agreements should