

with this specific bath salt? Is it relaxing candles or lotion? Is it soap? No. The item customers most buy with this bath salt is Click N Smoke all In One Vaporizer With Wind Proof Torch Lighter. That is the name of the product. One does not need much of an imagination to believe that the purchasers of Cloud 9 are smoking these drugs and not adding them to a relaxing bath.

These drugs are the worst kind. Not only do they cause people to perform horrible actions, but they also give the impression that they are legal, that they are innocuous. Make no mistake that these drugs can and will cause harm to their users. At least 30 States, including my home State of New York, have recognized these drugs as harmful. They have banned bath salts at the State level. But only the DEA—the Drug Enforcement Agency—and the resources that are behind it can keep these drugs from coming into our country, from crossing State lines, and from morphing time and again to evade State bans. That is why we need these bills.

The DEA temporarily banned two of these substances in November. However, the clock is now ticking until this temporary ban ends. FDA and HHS must complete a complicated checklist in the remaining 7 months to prevent these drugs from returning to the corner store.

We must provide the DEA with a permanent ban before the time runs out. This will provide them with the necessary tools to address these legal drugs on a national stage. The DEA has the ability to spearhead multi-State and international investigations to prevent the manufacture and sale of bath salts.

These drugs are deadly and dangerous. Yet they are easier to buy than cigarettes in many States. Parents should not worry that each time their child goes into a convenience store or gas station, he or she can buy a deadly drug.

This bill has broad bipartisan support. We cannot wait for another parent to lose a child because of the inaction of the Senate. I look forward to working with my colleagues to pass the legislation. Once again, I implore my colleague—the single Senator who is holding up this bill—I hope he will not agree to set aside his differences, which come from a deep Libertarian ideological perspective that is different than most Americans have, but agree not to block them but to debate them and let them come up for a vote.

I thank the Chair.

I yield the floor and note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARDIN). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PORTMAN. 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. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to enter into a colloquy with my Republican colleagues for up to 30 minutes.

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

#### THE BUDGET

Mr. PORTMAN. As the Presiding Officer knows, this week the President sent his budget to Congress. This happens every year. The budget is a document that determines what the spending will be and what the revenues will be not just for the next fiscal year but for a 10-year period. So it is a document about what the direction of our country ought to be. It is a vision for the country, if you will.

It is being sent to the Congress at a time when we face extraordinary fiscal challenges. We have a record debt of over \$15 trillion. We have deficits that have been over \$1 trillion a year for the last several years, and it looks as though this year, once again, it will be well over \$1 trillion.

In comparison to previous years, we have a debt that is now as large as our entire economy, which is larger than at any time since World War II. In fact, as a country, we are spending more money at the Federal level than we ever have before—as a percent of GDP, more than we ever have since World War II. So these are times when we have a true fiscal crisis at our doorstep and we need to handle it.

We are borrowing over 35 cents of every \$1 we spend at the Federal level. In that context, I have to say I am very disappointed in the budget proposal that was sent to us because it is simply not up to the challenges we face. It taxes too much, it borrows too much, and it spends too much. Unfortunately, it adds another \$11 trillion to the national debt over this 10-year period—again, a debt that already tops 100 percent of our country's economy. It does nothing to change the fact that Social Security and Medicare are in trouble—very important programs, of course, but by not addressing them in this budget document it means what everybody knows, which is that unless we do something that will head toward solvency, this will continue to be the case.

Remarkably, I thought, the President proposes another \$350 billion in a so-called stimulus bill within this budget and pays for it either in red ink, with more borrowing, or by raising taxes. It actually raises taxes by nearly \$2 trillion over this 10-year period. This is despite the fact the Congressional Budget Office has told us that by raising taxes, we are going to hurt the economy. In fact, it would result in higher unemployment next year than this year.

We all know the long-term driver of these deficits is entitlement spending. These important programs, Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid, along with interest on the debt, are called

the mandatory spending part of the budget. That is now a bigger and bigger part of the budget and the fastest growing part of the budget. It is 64 percent of the budget this year.

Under what the President has proposed, for the next 10 years, that mandatory spending—which means it is not subject to annual appropriations by Congress; again, important programs but not on a sustainable path—this mandatory spending will grow from 64 percent of the budget—where it is today, which has grown and grown over the years—to 78 percent of the budget in 10 years, under the budget proposal the President has put forward.

Republicans, Democrats, Independents alike, we know this is not sustainable. It is not sustainable and, unfortunately, it is going to hurt these programs in a way that is going to make it very difficult for our seniors and others who rely on them.

Overall, the President's promise of deficit reduction also does not look like it works. The budget claims \$5.3 trillion in deficit reduction over the next decade. However, if we look at it, that \$5.3 trillion does not come from spending cuts. Looking at a budget table, table 3—and I ask folks at home to take a look at this—99.9 percent of that \$5.3 trillion in so-called deficit reduction does not come from spending cuts, it comes from tax increases—almost \$2 trillion—a savings that is considered to be a gimmick of saying we are not going to spend as much in Iraq and Afghanistan. Everybody knows we are not going to spend as much there. Yet they take credit for that. Already enacted spending caps—remember, the discretionary spending caps were put in place, the so-called sequestration or across-the-board cuts, they take credit for those which have already been enacted and then, finally, the net interest savings from all those policies, which is about \$800 billion, they say.

So again, almost all that so-called deficit reduction over the next decade comes not from spending cuts but, in fact, from either gimmicks, tax increases or things Congress has already done. That leaves very little—about \$4 billion out of the \$5.3 trillion—that is truly spending reductions.

By the way, on top of that, in the so-called baseline that the President bases his numbers off of—in other words, we have to determine what would the spending otherwise be—in that baseline, there is another \$479 billion in new spending on Pell grants, the Medicare doc fix, and so on.

So the spending savings completely vanish when we put all that together. That is not the kind of budget we need right now.

Last year, the President submitted a budget that I thought was a good political document, also, but did not address our budget problems, and we took it to the floor of this Senate for a vote. In the Senate, last year, the President's budget was voted on by Republicans and Democrats, and it lost by a vote of 97 to 0.

I do not know how this budget would do if it came to the floor, but I am not sure it would fare much better because, frankly, when we look at this objectively, it is hard to say it addresses the very real problems we face. These are problems that relate to our spending and relate to the fact that we have these big deficits and debt, but also it relates to what is going on at kitchen tables all over America, which is people are having a harder time finding work, keeping jobs, making ends meet.

The economy is tough in my own State of Ohio. We not only have high unemployment, but we have record numbers of weeks where people have been on unemployment—approximately 40 weeks now. We have a lot of people who have given up looking for work altogether. Unless we get this budget deficit and debt under control and add more predictability and certainty to our economy and to what is going to happen with these huge deficits and debt that seem to be taking us toward what is happening in Greece, Italy or Spain—unless we do that, we are not going to be able to turn this economy around and give people the kind of confidence they are looking for to be able to make investments and move our country forward.

There are some other folks who are with me in the Chamber today. I would like to ask them if they would not mind talking about their budget perspective, what they see in this budget, the concerns they might have, and the ideas we have to try to improve our fiscal situation, therefore, our economy.

I see the ranking member of the Budget Committee is here.

I say to Senator SESSIONS, I know he wants to speak briefly on this issue.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I thank Senator PORTMAN for his comments and for his leadership on the Budget Committee. We have three fabulous new members on the Budget Committee in Senator TOOMEY, Senator PORTMAN, and Senator RON JOHNSON, who are with us and will share their perspectives as new members on the Budget Committee.

At a time of fiscal crisis, as Senator PORTMAN has described, it is very important the leadership of America speak honestly to the American people about the challenges we face and how we plan to go about fixing them. That is right. That is fair. That is just. It is wrong, it is unfair, and unjust to spin plans, to misrepresent the impact of policies in a way that confuses the American people and our colleagues in Washington about what is going on.

So our colleagues who are here understand the numbers. They are going to make some very good points. I will just say, as a member of the committee and the ranking Republican, I am disappointed the budget does virtually nothing to change the debt trajectory we are on from the agreement we had last year and, in the course of it it raises taxes considerably and raises spending considerably, although the

Budget Director was so reluctant yesterday to acknowledge it raises spending. But it does raise spending in any fair and objective analysis of the situation we are in today with the current trajectory in the Budget Control Act we agreed to last year.

So we are at a crisis, and we need to have leadership that looks the American people in the eye and tells them of the crisis we are facing, the difficult challenges, and lays out a plan on how we can fix it. We can fix it. If we put ourselves on a sound path, we will have more growth and prosperity than a lot of people predict.

I thank Senator PORTMAN for the opportunity to share these few moments and for the contribution he and our other colleagues are making to this important national debate.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his leadership on the Budget Committee.

I see we have also been joined by one of our new Members, a freshman Member, who comes from the business side of things. He ran a manufacturing company, so he has an interesting perspective on Federal budgeting. I love to ask folks who are in business: Could you see doing business where you were borrowing 35 cents of every \$1 you spent? The answer is: I wouldn't stay in business very long.

With that, I would like to hear from Senator JOHNSON of Wisconsin.

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. President, I thank Senator PORTMAN. Again, I so value his experience. Being the head of OMB himself, he understands these numbers.

What I have been trying to do over the last couple days is, I have been trying to figure out where is this \$4 trillion worth of deficit reduction.

I have a chart on the debt in the Chamber. I have shown this chart in the past. I like this—I do not like it, but I like this depiction of the debt. It goes back to 1987, when our Federal debt was \$2.3 trillion. It took us 200 years to incur that much debt, and we just entered an agreement—I did not vote for it, but we entered an agreement to increase the debt ceiling by \$2.1 trillion, and we will blow through that in about 2 years.

But if we take a look at the debt President Obama in his latest budget is projecting 10 years into the future, it is \$25.9 trillion. In last year's budget, it was about \$26.3 trillion. Again, I am trying to do the math. If we reduce the deficit by \$4 trillion, one would think that final debt figure would also be reduced, and it simply is not.

I realize the President is talking about a balanced approach. But you know as well as I do we have a spending problem, and that is what the next chart is trying to portray.

If we take a look at 10-year spending, in the 1990s, our Federal Government spent \$16 trillion in total. In the last decade, we spent \$28 trillion. In President Obama's budget for last year, he was projecting spending over 10 years

of \$46 trillion. In his new budget—just 1 year further into the future—he is projecting \$47 trillion over 10 years.

Again, I do not see where there is \$4 trillion worth of deficit reduction. I am an accountant. I am going to continue to look through the budget. I am afraid I am not going to truly come up with it.

I think what is very disappointing about President Obama's budget is that he simply is not grappling with what we all realize. I think everybody in Washington realizes what is driving our debts and deficit long term is Social Security and Medicare spending.

Just a quick little chart in terms of where we are in terms of Social Security. In 2010, we went cash negative, which means the amount of the payroll is not covering the benefits—by \$51 billion in 2010, \$46 billion last year. By the year 2035, we will accumulate \$6 trillion in deficit spending in Social Security alone, and the President's budget is silent on Social Security. The President's budget is silent on Medicare.

He has had 4 years. Why doesn't he propose something? The only thing he is proposing is a tax on millionaires. He is asking Congress to hop on board and let's pass corporate tax reform. Why doesn't he propose it? There is actually a growing consensus about progrowth tax reform.

I want to agree with this President on something to enact something. But he needs to lead, and he is not leading on these issues.

I want to finish my little part by talking about those millionaires on whom President Obama wants to raise taxes.

I have been doing an awful lot of telephone townhall meetings. Last week, we had a very interesting call. After a couple of my constituents from Wisconsin asked me why I would not support a millionaires' tax, we had a call from an elderly woman, and I could tell she was afraid. She was scared. She said: Senator JOHNSON, I am so concerned about what is going to happen to our taxes. My husband and I have been building a business all our lives. All our assets are wrapped up in that business, and now my husband has been sick for 2 years. He has not been able to work in the business. I have been trying to make a go of it, and now we are going to have to sell the business. In maybe 1 year, when we sell this business, I might report one million dollars' worth of income, and I am so concerned: Am I going to be paying that 15-percent tax on my retirement fund, which is my business, or am I going to be paying a 30-percent tax?

The fact is, that is whom this President wants to punish—people such as that woman in Wisconsin who has her entire retirement wrapped up in her business, and she is going to sell it. That is on whom President Obama wants to double the tax.

Again, I think that puts a face on the type of people President Obama wants to punish. I think that is a tragedy. I

would like to see the President lead on the debt and deficit issue far better than he has.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I thank Senator JOHNSON for his perspective, and it is very helpful.

We are now going to hear from another colleague who also is a new Member of the Senate but has a lot of experience in what makes the economy work and has been promoting progrowth tax reform and progrowth regulatory relief and other things to actually move the economy to generate more revenue in the right way, which is through growth, PAT TOOMEY from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I thank Senator PORTMAN for organizing this colloquy and Senator JOHNSON for his contribution.

Let me start by making this point: It seems to me the two top priorities the budget—and most of what we do—ought to have are, No. 1, policies that will help encourage strong economic growth, a recovery that we need and the job creation that would come with it—that is No. 1—and No. 2, putting our Federal Government on a sustainable path because we are not on a sustainable fiscal path now, and if we do not get on a sustainable path soon, we are inviting a crisis. We are inviting a disaster.

It is my view that the President's budget fails badly on both fronts. On the economic front, there are a number of areas. First and foremost is a budget that proposes a growing budget deficit. The President who promised us in his first term he would cut the deficit in half, in fact, is proposing in fiscal year 2012—this year—a deficit that is bigger than last year and almost as big as the alltime record high—nowhere near cutting these deficits in half. Huge deficits themselves have a chilling effect on economic growth because they discourage investment.

Everybody knows when we are racking up massive amounts of debt, unprecedented amounts of debt—as we are doing right now—there is a huge threat that the result will be either dramatic inflation or much higher taxes or both. Given that threat, businesses and entrepreneurs, understandably, are reluctant to take a risk, to make an investment, to grow a business, to hire workers. So that is point No. 1.

Point No. 2 that I would like to make is a little bit more technical and very specific; that is, the President's idea that we ought to tax dividend income, which is to say investment in business, at ordinary income rates instead of at the current 15-percent rate. I just want to illustrate why I think that is a particularly bad idea and why it will hurt our economy and weaken our ability to create jobs.

This little chart demonstrates what this means is, what the President is proposing is effectively a 63-percent tax on investment in a business. The reason I say that is as follows: If you

can imagine, let's say you have saved some money and you want to invest in a business so that business can grow and hire workers. How will these taxes be paid?

Right now, we have just about the highest corporate income tax rate in the world. So if you make an investment in a business and that business makes a profit, the first thing that company has to do is pay \$35 of every \$100 it makes. Let's assume the company makes \$100. At the 35-percent top income tax rate that the company pays, \$35 is taken, goes to the government. So the aftertax income for that business is \$65. That is what the owners of the business get, right? Not quite.

If the dividend is then paid to the owners of the business, the President wants that to be taxed now at the ordinary income tax rate. By the way, he wants that rate to go from the current rate of 35 percent up to 43.4 percent. A top marginal income tax rate of 39.6 percent, plus the 3.8 percent from the health care bill that was passed, brings the top marginal income tax rate to 43 percent.

I know this gets a little bit confusing, but at the end of the day, it is not that complicated. The \$65 that is remaining after the corporation pays its income tax—if that gets paid to the investor—that now, under the President's plan, would be subject to a 43-percent further tax.

That is another \$28 that gets taken from that initial \$100 of income, leaving the investor with \$37 out of the \$100 this business makes. So the President's plan is, if you want to invest in a business to help grow this economy and create jobs, the business—your activity—will be subject to having almost two-thirds of the income taken and you are left with about one-third.

What is the net effect? It is a huge disincentive to invest, to grow a business, to take a risk. Most of the rest of the world does not have tax rates this high, does not have a corporate tax rate this high, and therefore it is a further incentive for capital to move elsewhere.

I think we ought to pursue policies that encourage maximum economic growth, not policies that absolutely discourage savings and investment and the growth that comes with it.

If Senator PORTMAN tells me I have a couple of other minutes, I will make one more point; that is, to switch to the sustainable fiscal profile which we are not on now.

The President, to his credit, has put his finger on precisely what is the long-term problem we face. He has described it as the mandatory health care spending, the entitlement programs, as a general matter. He is exactly right. When we look at his budget, it is very revealing.

If we take just the following categories—Medicare, Social Security, Medicaid, and interest on our debt, just those items—and look at what the President has proposed for those items

over the next 10 years, it is an average annual increase of almost 8 percent—7.8 percent to be precise. But he is only proposing that the economy is going to be able to grow by about 5 percent.

Frankly, that is optimistic. So what happens if we have huge government programs growing faster than the economy each and every year for as far as the eye can see? That is the definition of unsustainable because these programs consume ever more of the budget and ever more of the economy until something has to collapse.

This is why I am so disappointed the President has not so much as suggested an idea for how we might reform the long-term, totally unsustainable path they are on. Most of us—Republicans in this body and in the other body—believe we need to make some changes for future retirees. We are not talking about changing the rules for people who are currently retired or about to retire but people my age and younger and my kids. When are we going to acknowledge that we have to fix this so these programs can survive for the next generation?

If we refuse, if we continue to go on this path, we are going to face the kind of financial crisis they are facing in Europe. We have a limited window of opportunity to solve this. It is not too late for us to avoid the fate of our friends on the other side of the Atlantic. But I would suggest we do not have time to lose.

I think the President has missed the big opportunity to provide some leadership. I hope we will make up for that in this body.

With that, I would be happy to yield back to my colleague from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I thank Senator TOOMEY. I appreciate his focusing on the progrowth elements because, as I said at the outset, a budget is an opportunity to set the Nation on a 10-year course, both on the spending side—how much should the government spend—but also on the revenue side. That means we are getting into how to grow the economy because the right tax reform will generate more growth. That growth will generate more revenue in the right way.

Unfortunately, if we look at the proposal the President has made, it does nothing to help improve our economic growth. In fact, when the dividend tax was moved down to 15 percent, it was done so because, as Senator TOOMEY has rightfully pointed out, it is a double tax. In other words, it has already been taxed once at the company level. So when we get a dividend paid, we should not have to pay a high tax on it again.

In fact, because of that double taxation, as he has indicated, there will be a tax—total tax of over 60 percent. By the way, in the President's budget, the dividend tax was increased from 15 percent to 39.6 percent for some taxpayers. Then, as Senator TOOMEY has said, we can add the surcharge that comes from the health care bill and get it up into the forties for the individual.

Most people did not expect that. It is an example where this budget actually went further in terms of trying to, again, tax people more and therefore have less growth than anyone expected. Most people thought it would go from 15 percent to 20 percent or 25 percent, but not all of the way to—almost tripling the tax on dividends.

So it is an example where, in this budget, there was an opportunity to lay out a pro-growth path that included tax reform. Instead, we are building on our current antiquated, inefficient tax system and just lopping more taxes on top, including taxes on capital gains and on dividends that will make it more difficult for us to have the kind of investment we need to get this economy moving again.

The President, when he ran for election in 2008, pledged to reform entitlements. Senator TOOMEY talked about the fact that he has continued to talk about that, the need for it. I certainly agree with that, as do, by the way, most of my colleagues in the Senate, Democrat and Republican alike.

The budget, of course, does nothing to help. In fact, it increases the cost significantly on entitlements, as Senator TOOMEY has said, an 8-percent increase on average for these important programs. But that puts them on an unsustainable footing when the economy will not be growing nearly that fast.

Instead of doing something to reform these programs, making them work better, the President is just continuing to pile on more entitlements. But in 2008 the President also said he was going to cut the deficit in half. At that time the deficit that first year of his administration was \$1.4 trillion. He proposed to cut it in half over the 4-year term. So now we are in 2012, the final of his 4 years—fiscal year—and their estimate for the deficit this year—from the Office of Management and Budget, from the Congressional Budget Office—is that we will be over \$1.3 trillion.

So it does not sound like he has cut the deficit in half. Some will say, well, it is less as a percent of our economy. That is true. Our economy has grown some. But it is still not close to cutting it in half. A lot of things happen during a Presidential term. But I would hope that the President, in putting forward a budget, would have put forward a serious effort to reduce the deficit significantly, to get this economy back on track and prepare for, again, this unsustainable growth in entitlements by truly reforming the programs to make them work better and to make them sustainable over time.

We still have the opportunity to do that in the Senate. It is an election year, but we still have 8 or 9 months until the election. We should get busy working together as Republicans and Democrats, not follow the President's budget because, unfortunately, it does not provide the guidance we need. But we need to follow what all of us know

in our hearts has to be done, which is grow the economy through pro-growth, sensible approaches such as tax reform, regulatory relief, and using more of our own natural resources in this country. We can help grow the economy on the one hand and, therefore, create revenue.

Then, second, we ought to do everything we can to reform these programs to make them sustainable, to reduce annually appropriated spending in ways that are responsible—not just to our kids and grandkids, as important as that is, but to today's economy to ensure that we can, indeed, have a strong recovery that all of us hope for and begin to bring people back to the workforce, create jobs, get this economy moving again, and give people that dignity and self-respect that comes from work.

I am glad to have had the opportunity to talk about this budget.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant editor of the Daily Digest proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### SURFACE TRANSPORTATION ACT

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I thank the Chair for his leadership. I am here today to appeal to this body. I think the Presiding Officer, I know myself, and a whole host of folks in this body have been concerned about where the country is going. I know many of us have talked about ways of reforming our Medicare system at some point, which I realize may not happen this year, and our Medicaid system, and to move our country to a place where it works fiscally for all Americans. We have talked about all kinds of things. Shoot, I think there have been over 50 or 60 Senators involved in trying to reach consensus on those issues.

Today, we are debating a highway bill. I know we have had a lot of great work that has taken place in EPW, a lot of great work in the Commerce Committee, in the Banking Committee, and in the Finance Committee. What we have done in this bill—and I so appreciate our leadership allowing us to look at this bill in this way—is to move to one portion of the bill and then adding other portions on to the bill. So I thank the leadership of the Senate for letting us look at the bill in this way.

I know there are provisions in the Finance component that are being worked out now before the Finance piece comes to the floor, and again I appreciate the people working on that. But it was my understanding—and I think I am right—that the major components of that Finance work were not supposed to change, yet here we are

and what we are getting ready to do with this highway bill is pretty unbelievable.

All of us want to see infrastructure in this country built. I know the Senator from Maryland is a strong proponent of that and has lobbied heavily for that. I was the mayor of a city at a time when it seemed we had nothing but orange barrels, so I thought it was very important we had proper infrastructure.

But with all of the consensus that has developed in the Senate around trying to solve our big issues, here is what we are doing. And many people on the other side of the aisle—my friends—can remember the debate during health care. One of the things that many people on my side of the aisle argued was a problem with the health care bill was that we were going to use 6 years worth of cost and 10 years worth of revenue. That was one of the things that actually got a lot of people's attention and concerned people on both sides of the aisle. What we are doing with this bill is even more egregious. What we are doing with this highway bill is we have 2 years' worth of cost and 10 years of revenue.

Again, I know all of us want to see a highway bill put in place. I think most of us want to see a long-term highway bill put in place. But let me explain what is happening. The Senator from Maryland and I, every year or so, have to deal with something called SGR. It is the sustainability growth rate for Medicare. We put a formula in place back in 1997, but we haven't owned up to that. So what we do every year and a half or so is we kick the can further down the road and we create what is called a financial cliff at the end of it. Every time we deal with that, it gets more and more expensive.

I understand people here in the Senate don't want to support physicians across their States, so we keep kicking the can down the road and not finding a way for a long-term solution that all of us know needs to be in place. I personally understand how people are concerned with how we reform Medicare. It affects a lot of seniors in our States, and we want to make sure we do that in the right way.

What I don't understand is why on this highway bill, which has a trust set up—and by the way, it doesn't have the same type of constituency. I shouldn't be talking politics, but it doesn't. We deal with all of our Governors back home. But why on this highway bill are we creating exactly the same problem for our highway program that we have with SGR? What we are effectively doing, if we pass this bill in the way the Finance Committee has come up with paying for it, is we have created exactly the problem we have with SGR. I cannot imagine why anyone in this body wants to see us take one problem and transfer it to something else that so many of our Governors and people across our country depend upon.

So here we are, in a situation where we all know our fiscal situation is not