

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from California for her remarks about Sean and his service to this country. He clearly represents all those marines, soldiers, and others who have given their lives and the many others who have been casualties of conflicts on behalf of the American people.

We do, indeed, owe them our debt of gratitude and we, as policymakers, in the country owe them decisionmaking which ensures that their sacrifices will not have been in vain.

#### ECONOMIC STIMULUS PACKAGE

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I wish to turn to the business at hand, which is the so-called economic stimulus package. I have not had an opportunity to offer my personal views on this issue.

I do not believe that tax rebate checks and an extension of unemployment benefits will boost the economy. Of course, Americans deserve to keep more of their hard-earned dollars and Washington should spend less of them. But giving people tax rebates and telling them to go shopping will do virtually nothing to grow our economy. Our economy grows—GDP increases—when new goods and services are produced. A one-time shopping spree is not going to encourage a business to hire one additional worker or invest in one additional machine. Only a permanent reduction in tax rates will do that.

Gross domestic product increased by just 0.6 percent in the fourth quarter of 2007. While most economists do not forecast that the U.S. economy will enter recession this year, they do estimate it will enter a period of below-trend growth in the first half of 2008, with growth recovering in the third and fourth quarters.

The current unemployment rate is 4.9 percent; down from 5 percent in December. The drop is due to an upward revision in the number of jobs created in December.

The preliminary estimate is that the number of jobs created in January fell by 17,000—the first decline in many months. But note that a very small increase in December job creation was revised upward to 82,000 new jobs. Also, the initial August 2007 jobs reading showed a 4,000 job decline, but it too was revised upward substantially. The January figure could well be revised upward.

Over the past 30 years, from 1977 to 2007, personal consumption has grown steadily and strongly and has not fallen off during economic downturns.

In contrast, during times of economic weakness, private investment declines significantly. We are seeing this very thing happen during this economic downturn as well.

The Treasury Secretary negotiated an agreement with the bipartisan House leadership. That agreement was fairly simple:

It provides a rebate of \$600 for individuals and \$1,200 for married filers, and gives parents another \$300 for each child. The rebate is phased out for individuals with adjusted gross income of more than \$75,000, and couples with adjusted gross income of \$150,000.

It also expands the ability of small businesses to expense new equipment purchases for 2008 and gives businesses of all sizes the ability to write off 50 percent the cost of many new depreciable assets placed in service in 2008.

The House bill was passed on January 29 by a vote of 385 to 35.

The administration predicts that the proposal would boost the economy by about 0.7 percent. In reality, that “growth” would be borrowed from the future. It would not create new growth.

While I disagree with the central premise of the House-passed bill—that we need to stimulate consumer spending—I am impressed that the bill was very narrowly focused and that it generally did not include new spending.

While the House bill was not the bill I would have written, I feared that it would become far worse in the Senate. It has.

The bill passed out of the Finance Committee dedicates \$10 billion to extend unemployment benefits. Our current unemployment rate is 4.9 percent. Congress has never before extended unemployment benefits when the rate is this low. Because extending unemployment benefits has the effect of lengthening the traditional spell of unemployment by 1 to 2 weeks, this provision effectively eliminates any possible stimulative effect of the bill.

It also included a slightly smaller tax rebate—\$500 per individual, \$1,000 per couple, \$300 per child. Unlike the House bill, the rebate would be available to senior citizens and disabled veterans who otherwise have no earned income. While I generally oppose the idea of rebate checks, this change from the House bill is probably one on which we can agree. But we should understand that fully 42 percent of the rebate approved by the Finance Committee is classified as “spending” because it would go to individuals with no tax liability.

The Finance bill also seeks to ensure that illegal immigrants cannot legally obtain tax rebates, something we all support.

The Finance package also includes the same business tax breaks as the House bill but adds a 5-year carryback for net operating losses. This is an important provision that I helped to have included in the Finance bill and I would support adding it to the House bill.

From this point, the Finance Committee bill really becomes a Christmas tree. All kinds of legislative ornaments have been attached:

\$3 billion for utilities wind and solar energy production;

\$1.6 billion for energy-efficient homes, not particularly wise, given the glut of new homes on the markets;

\$323 million for manufacturers of energy-efficient appliances;

\$247 million for tax breaks for wealthier investors in marginal oil and gas wells;

\$153 million to for energy-efficient commercial buildings; and

\$100 million for coal companies owed interest by the Federal government from a court case.

Interestingly, the committee defeated an amendment I offered to patch the AMT for 2008.

The committee defeated an amendment offered by Senator ENSIGN to provide another repatriation window, during which companies could bring back overseas earnings at a much-reduced tax rate.

The committee also denied me an opportunity to offer a package of individual and business tax provisions that expired at the end of 2007 and other provisions that expire at the end of this year, including:

- the teacher tax deduction,
- the tuition deduction,
- the R&D tax credit,
- accelerated depreciation for leaseholds and restaurants, and
- extending foreign tax changes that help U.S. multinationals compete—active financing and the CFC look-through.

At best, proposals for short-term, demand-side stimulus will borrow economic growth and consumer spending from the future, and will appear to create a small boost for the economy.

My real worry is that we are doing a disservice to all Americans if we tell them that increasing consumer spending is a panacea to our economic problems.

We would be far wiser to recognize that our short-term challenge now is deflated home values and a glut of housing, along with insufficient liquidity in the capital markets—none of which will be fixed by this, or the House-passed, stimulus bill.

The only viable remedy is to focus on policies that encourage sustainable economic growth by encouraging work, investment, and entrepreneurship.

We are scheduled to see across-the-board hikes in income tax rates and investment tax rates, as the current rates automatically expire, reverting to the pre-2001 and pre-2003 higher rates—and we know from economists that the only way to encourage sustainable economic growth is to encourage work, savings, and investment through lower marginal rates.

No one is willing to see the child tax credit cut in half, the marriage penalty spring back to life, or a host of other popular provisions disappear.

Washington is slowly coming to the realization that our corporate tax rate of 35 percent hurts American competitiveness. Only one OECD country—Japan—has a higher rate.

In fact, I filed an amendment to cut the corporate rate to 25 percent when the Finance Committee considered the economic stimulus bill. Larry Kudlow had this to say about my amendment:

In my view, this would be the single best pro-growth measure that Washington could take. It would help create healthy businesses, create jobs, and raise real wages. It also would boost the dollar. The minute such a bill is signed—the very minute—the incentive effects would take place.

Last year, the Treasury Department released a study of American competitiveness and determined that our high corporate tax rate is in fact a barrier to encouraging businesses to locate in the U.S.

Also in 2007, CHARLIE RANGEL, the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, unveiled a comprehensive tax reform proposal which included a reduction in the corporate tax rate to 30 percent. There seems to be a growing consensus across party lines that our corporate tax rate should be reduced.

Another idea that has been gaining traction is reducing the corporate capital gains rate. This would have a tremendous “unlocking effect.” It simply makes no sense to tax corporate capital gains at 35 percent; such a high tax rate only encourages companies to hold on to unproductive assets.

For years and years, investors and Government officials have debated whether the Treasury Department has the necessary authority to index capital gains for inflation without Congress needing to act legislatively. I believe there is a case to be made that Treasury does have the authority, and I hope the President will take this bold step in his final year.

Forty-two percent of the cost of the Senate Finance Committee economic stimulus “rebate” goes to Americans with no tax liability.

The percentage of Americans who actually pay taxes continues to shrink and our ability to raise revenue by increasing taxes on “the wealthy” is a losing proposition.

In 2004, 37 percent of all Federal personal income taxes were paid by the top 1 percent of taxpayers; the bottom half of taxpayers, by adjusted gross income, pay just 3.3 percent of Federal personal income taxes. We run the very real risk of developing a system whereby a majority of Americans do not have a stake in limiting the size of our Federal Government because they do not have to pay for it.

Congress should consider some research explained in a recent Wall Street Journal column by Art Laffer. Art Laffer explains that the highest income earners are the most sensitive to tax increases and the most likely to plan to avoid tax increases. He found that over the last 25 years, as the top income tax rates fell, the share of income taxes and the dollar-value of taxes paid by the top 1 percent of taxpayers increased dramatically. Over that same period, as income tax rates fell for the bottom 75 percent of taxpayers, both the share of Federal income taxes paid and the dollar amount of income taxes paid fell too.

Laffer points out that the temptation to cut taxes in the lower brackets—or only retain the current rate structure

for the lower brackets—while raising taxes for taxpayers in the top brackets is completely counterproductive. The only tax cuts that seem to result in increased revenues are those that affect the wealthiest taxpayers because they have the ability to defer income, invest in tax deferred accounts, invest in tax-exempt bonds, and otherwise plan around taxes.

Art Laffer closes his article with this statement:

Mark my words: If the Democrats succeed in implementing their plan to tax the rich and cut taxes on the middle and lower income earners, this country will experience a fiscal crisis of serious proportions that will last for years and years. . . .

While Congress is focusing on stimulating consumer spending and short-term economic fixes, we must remember that it makes far better sense to plan for long-term, sustainable economic growth. We must not let this deviation into Keynesian economics become an excuse for massive increases in government spending, tax policies geared toward short-term consumer spending; we must not ignore the importance of long-term savings and investment and we must remember to reward hard work with permanently low income tax rates.

As George Melloan wrote recently:

Ironically, even the brilliant John Maynard Keynes disowned [Keynesian Economics]. After meeting with a group of Washington “Keynesians” in 1944, he said he was the only non-Keynesian in the room. His brainchild . . . had been converted from its originally intended limited application to an all-purpose economic panacea by politicians, academics, and journalists.

I wish to summarize, in 3 or 4 minutes, what I think is at work here.

My view, contrary to the President and to some others in my party, is that tax rebate checks and extension of unemployment benefits will not boost the economy. Obviously, Americans deserve to keep more of their hard-earned dollars, and obviously Washington should spend less of them, but giving people tax rebates and telling them to go shopping will do virtually nothing to grow our economy.

Our economy grows; that is to say, the gross domestic product increases, when new goods and services are produced. A one-time shopping spree is not going to encourage business to hire one additional employee or invest in one additional machine. Only a permanent reduction in tax rates will do that.

I will share a couple statistics relating to the state of our economy now, particularly as it relates to unemployment.

The current unemployment rate is 4.9 percent. That is down from 5 percent in December. The drop is due to an upward revision of the number of jobs created in December. The preliminary estimate is that the number of jobs created in January fell by 17,000, which is the first decline in months. But note that a very small increase in December job creation was revised upward to 82,000 new jobs, and the initial August

2007 jobs reading showed a 4,000-job decline, but it also was revised substantially upward. So the January figure could also be revised upward.

The point is unemployment is at a relatively low level in this country, and it would be a huge mistake for us to exacerbate the unemployment situation by extending unemployment benefits, as the Senate Finance Committee does.

In addition, personal consumption is growing strongly and steadily, as it has over the last 30 years. It has not fallen off at all. What has fallen off, and this happens during times of economic weakness, is private investment, which has declined significantly, and that is what should be addressed but is not addressed, in the so-called stimulus package. Rather, what is addressed in the stimulus package is, of course, consumer spending which, in this case, is not the solution to the problem.

At best, proposals for short-term, demand-side stimulus will borrow economic growth and consumer spending from the future and will appear to create a small boost to the economy right now, but they are borrowing it from the future. Of course, we are also borrowing \$150 billion in order to accomplish this result.

My worry is we are doing a disservice to all Americans if we tell them an increase in consumer spending is a panacea to our economic problems. It is not. We would be far wiser to recognize our short-term challenge now is depleted home values, a glut of housing, along with insufficient liquidity in the capital markets, and none of this is fixed by the stimulus bill before us. The only viable remedy is to focus on policies that encourage sustainable economic growth by encouraging work, investment, and entrepreneurship.

One of the first things we have to address is to make sure we do not suffer a tax increase. That would be the worst thing that would happen, and we are headed for that if Congress does not take action to take that from taking place, which is automatically built into our tax laws. In 2 years, unless Congress does something, we will have the largest tax increase in the history of the country. So we should be signaling right now that is not going to happen.

We should also get in line with the other countries in the world and reduce our corporate income tax rate which, except for Japan, is the highest in the world. That would do something immediately to help.

We should also index taxes, such as the capital gains tax, for inflation. For years, investors and Government officials have debated whether the Treasury Department has the authority to do this. I believe it does have the authority to do it administratively and that we ought to do it. But if the administration doesn't do it, then the Congress ought to do it.

The bottom line is there is a variety of things we could do to actually stimulate economic growth to provide for

the long-term productivity increases in capital expansion and job creation that provide that kind of economic growth. That is what will solve the problem, not a one-time rebate for people who would far rather have a job than a \$500 check. So while we are focusing on stimulating consumer spending and the short-term economic fixes, my view is it would make far better sense to plan for the long term and to do those things which provide for actual sustainable growth.

We cannot let this deviation into so-called Keynesian economics become an excuse for massive tax increases and Government spending or tax policies geared toward short-term consumer spending. We must not ignore the importance of long-term savings and investment, and we must remember to reward hard work with permanently low income tax rates. As George Melloan recently wrote:

Ironically, even the brilliant John Maynard Keynes disowned Keynesian Economics. After meeting with a group of Washington "Keynesians" in 1944, he said he was the only non-Keynesian in the room. His brainchild had been converted from its originally intended limited application to an all-purpose economic panacea by politicians, academics, and journalists.

I hope we will not fall into the same trap this year, in 2008, but recognize there are some significant things we could do to stimulate the economy to ensure that the average American family is not burdened with increasing taxes. The first step in that direction is not to go another \$150 billion in debt by offering people rebate checks and an extension of unemployment compensation but, rather, by signaling to them we are serious about ensuring there will not be a big tax increase in this country.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, when I returned after the Christmas recess, along with all my colleagues, it was with high hopes that we would be able to work together to solve America's problems in a bipartisan way. There were some promising indications that would indeed be possible when the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Republican leader in the House and the President of the United States came together to deal with one of the emerging crises in our country, which is the economic downturn caused by the subprime lending crisis and a downturn in the housing markets.

Unfortunately, we have begun to see that bipartisan cooperation fraying and some downright foot-dragging that causes me a lot of concern. I can't help but think if I am concerned, there are a lot of other people, not only in this body but across the country, who are concerned by the contradiction between what Members of Congress sometimes say and what actually happens. Sometimes we can get caught up in the Senate rules regarding cloture and how the amendment process works, and that is the kind of thing Senators and

our staff like and we live with. Frankly, the one thing the American people can sense from a hundred miles off is hypocrisy—saying one thing and then doing another.

I heard it suggested one time that the opposite of the definition of progress must be Congress. It sounds to me like something Mark Twain or Will Rogers might say, to say that Congress is the opposite of progress. But we have had two examples of important legislation we should be acting upon in a timely way that have been dragged down by inexplicable delay, and I think it is important that we focus on that.

We have heard from the Republican leader this morning regarding his concerns that the bipartisan stimulus package, which, as Speaker PELOSI said, needed to be targeted, timely, and temporary, has now gotten bogged down in an attempt to add additional spending on that bill in a way that invites additional amendments on the floor of the Senate. That means further delay. Add to that a conference committee, which will then delay it even further, and that means the American people, who were expecting rebate checks on their taxes, will have to wait longer, and the chances that this stimulus will in fact be effective in helping to avert a recession makes it much less likely that it will have any impact whatsoever. So delay is costly in terms of our chances for having a positive impact on averting this recession.

#### FISA

Another area I want to talk about briefly has to do with our national security and our ability to listen to al-Qaida terrorists talk to each other either on the telephone or by e-mail or text messages. Last week, we spent an entire 3 days basically doing nothing while we tried to get the FISA reauthorization bill—the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act bill—passed on a bipartisan basis. Now you would think this is something we ought to be able to come together on in a bipartisan way. The bill that came out of the Intelligence Committee passed by a bipartisan vote of 13 to 2. But then it comes to the floor of the Senate and it becomes locked down in attempts to block this bipartisan legislation.

There has been the suggestion that we haven't had enough time to consider this legislation. Well, I think it is worth noting, as this chart does, the history of this important legislation.

You will remember that it was April of 2007 that the Director of National Intelligence suggested we needed significant reforms in our ability to listen in to conversations between terrorists overseas who were determined and committed to trying to kill innocent Americans and our allies. So the Director of National Intelligence last April said we need an update in this important law to make sure we aren't deaf to the threat or blind to the threat in a way that will endanger American lives.

In May of 2007, there was a significant decision made by the Foreign In-

telligence Surveillance Court which suggested that phone calls between two foreign nationals, circuted through the United States, had to get an order through a lengthy application process in order to listen in. The Director of National Intelligence suggested to us that we were missing as much as two-thirds of the actionable intelligence necessary to listen in to our enemies in order to detect, deter, and hopefully prevent terrorist attacks on our soil and against our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan.

In July of 2007, the Director of National Intelligence briefed Congress on the urgent need to update this law in light of these gaps. To its credit, the Senate did get together on a bipartisan basis, at least for a while, in August of 2007 to pass a 6-month piece of legislation. Why it was 6 months, I don't know. It should have been permanent. That legislation was the Protect America Act, which would have expired February 1 but for a 2-week extension that was recently agreed to. So the Senate can get its act together and do what it knows we have to do to protect American lives and to keep our Nation secure.

In October of 2007, the Intelligence Committee, as I noted earlier—the committee that is given the responsibility of oversight of our intelligence community and for keeping our intelligence laws up to date—passed a strong bipartisan bill supported by the Director of National Intelligence that would give the intelligence community all the tools consistent with our laws that it needed in order to keep America safe. It passed by 13 to 2—strong bipartisan support.

The Judiciary Committee then, in November of 2007, a committee on which I sit, unfortunately passed an alternative piece of legislation strictly along partisan lines that was designed to be a substitute. In December 2007, we tried to take up this issue because, again, it was going to expire, and we saw that our Democratic friends basically blocked the Intelligence Committee bill in December of 2007.

On January 23, after we returned from the Christmas holidays and the New Year's break, we returned to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act legislation with the knowledge, as I said, that it was going to expire by February 1 if we didn't act. Well, frankly, because of the meltdown here in the Senate and our inability to pass basic legislation that is necessary to keep America safe, because of the gamesmanship that is going on, we had to pass a temporary extension which is now set to expire February 15.

I don't understand why it is that the Senate seems to be incapable of getting its business taken care of. When we come back with such high hopes that we are going to see a change in attitude and that we will be working together in a bipartisan way to solve the problems that confront our country—whether it is our economy or national

security—it seems to last about as long as a winter snow on a warm day. It sounds good and looks good 1 day, and then melts away the next day. We need to stop squandering these opportunities to work together. We need to get some work done.

Last night, even though the majority leader had previously told us we would not be voting on either Monday or Tuesday, in light of the big election vote that was going to occur today, he changed his mind, and it is his prerogative to do so, so we had a vote on the economic stimulus package that the House passed, and which the Republican leader said we should take up and pass in a bipartisan way in order to expedite that legislation. The motion we voted on last night passed overwhelmingly in support of that House legislation by 80 to 4—80 to 4.

So why it is we can't, in a similar fashion, take up that legislation and pass it without slowing it down by adding on a lot of extraneous spending by people viewing this as a Christmas tree on which they want to hang their favorite ornament as a way to fund their pet projects; Why it is we can't resist that temptation and expedite passage of this important legislation is, frankly, beyond me. I wish we would take care of the Nation's business. Unfortunately, the majority leader handed us his alternative legislation last night, a 70-plus-page bill that is completely different both from the Finance Committee bill that was passed out of the Senate and the House bill that has been negotiated between the Speaker and the White House and the Republican leader in the House.

I think we ought to be aware of high-pressure tactics, and that was certainly a high-pressure tactic to try to come up with a brandnew bill that nobody has looked at and insist we pass that bill without an adequate time to review it and to see what goodies have been inserted in this piece of legislation that some of us may object to. So it is my sincere hope we will not continue to squander the opportunities we have been presented with to work together to pass this economic stimulus package on a bipartisan basis, or this Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act reauthorization which has been on the radar for the Senate since at least April of 2007. There is simply no excuse for not acting on a timely basis to deal with both of these issues.

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

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

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. 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. DURBIN. I ask if the Chair would advise me as to the current status of morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republicans control 6 minutes 15 seconds, the Democrats control 29 minutes.

Mr. DURBIN. I ask unanimous consent that the Republican time be reserved; that I be allowed to speak in morning business on the Democratic side.

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

#### OBSTRUCTIONISM

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I was on the floor earlier this morning when Senator MCCONNELL came and made a little statement I would like to address at this moment because it seems to me Senator MCCONNELL said a few things which bear repeating.

He was critical of the bill which we passed in the Senate Finance Committee to try to get the American economy back on its feet. The economy is struggling now. We had troubling unemployment figures last week. We know the President said repeatedly we are moving toward a recession. We know a recession means high unemployment, business failures, and lost opportunities for Americans and American business.

So we certainly want to do everything we can to stop that. One of the things that has been done by the Federal Reserve is to cut interest rates in the hope that people will be encouraged to borrow money responsibly for purchases such as cars and homes and the like and that those purchases will breathe some life into the economy.

Then there is the other side of the ledger when it comes to our economy, what we can do in Congress and with the President. What we try to do is to give Americans more spending power. Right now there is less consumer confidence. People are worried about bills they have to pay, health insurance that has gone up dramatically over the last 7 years, the cost of gasoline which many in my home State of Illinois, particularly downstate, know very well personally has increased in cost dramatically.

We also understand people putting their kids through college have seen tremendous increases in the cost of college education. The increase in the cost of food, that sort of thing, has led a number of people to be worried about whether they should make a big expenditure. So one of the things we are considering is something to stimulate the economy, an economic stimulus package, what can we do, how can we put spending power and confidence back in the hands of American families.

The President met with the Speaker of the House, NANCY PELOSI, and the Republican leader, JOHN BOEHNER, and worked out at least the beginning of that stimulus approach. What they suggested was they would send checks of about \$600 to individual taxpayers

across America within certain income limits and \$1,200 for a family and extra for those with children.

That money would go directly to a lot of people who will spend it because there are folks who are struggling month to month, paycheck to paycheck. That is a good thing to do. It is a group that has often been overlooked recently, that the tax cuts in Washington, under this administration, have not focused on giving helping hands to working families as much as giving a helping hand to those who do not need it, the wealthiest in our country.

So this idea of an economic stimulus, which finally focuses our attention on struggling families, is a good thing. The House passed its version in a bipartisan fashion, sent it over to the Senate to consider. Senator MAX BAUCUS, Chairman of the Finance Committee, met with that committee, and worked on ways to change it or improve it that they think would be helpful.

At the end of the day, the proposal by the Senate Finance Committee, which passed with a bipartisan vote, three Republicans joining the Democrats in voting for it, is one that I think is a better package, a better approach.

The House's is good. I like the House stimulus approach, but I think the Senate stimulus package is better.

This morning MCCONNELL came to the floor, the Republican Senate leader. He was very critical of what the Senate Finance Committee passed on a bipartisan basis. He was critical of their measure, which passed with the support of Republican Senators.

He used phrases and terms in describing it that I think are worth looking into. Senator MCCONNELL suggested we were involved in pet projects in this Senate stimulus package.

Well, I have taken a look at it. I am curious as to what pet projects he is talking about. I find it hard to believe the Republicans feel 21 million seniors who will receive a helping hand with the Senate Finance Committee are somehow superfluous, not important, they are pet projects.

Well, I have to concede that point. The seniors of America are a pet project of mine and most Senators. We know many of them live on fixed incomes, struggle from month to month to get by, worry about paying their utility bills and making sure they can pay for their prescription drugs.

So giving them a helping hand, as we do in the Senate Finance bill, is a good thing. Good for them. Good for our economy. Senator MCCONNELL was obviously very critical of that. He hasn't said directly, but I wish he would go on record: Does he or does he not support providing an economic rebate check for 21 million Americans, those seniors who otherwise would not get a helping hand?

So when Senator MCCONNELL returns to the floor, will he sign up for our pet project to help 21 million Americans or is he against it? I am sure the voters of Kentucky would love to know.