unprecedented deficits forecast for the next decade, this is definitely not a time to start a major new spending program.

A second key goal of the Obama health plan is to slow the growth of health-care spending. The president's budget calls explicitly for cutting Medicare to help pay for the expanded benefits for low-income individuals. But the administration's goal is bigger than that. It is to cut dramatically the amount of health care that we all consume.

A recent report by the White House Council of Economic Advisers claims that the government can cut the projected level of health spending by 15 percent over the next decade and by 30 percent over the next 20 years. Although the reduced spending would result from fewer services rather than lower payments to providers, we are told that this can be done without lowering the quality of care or diminishing our health. I don't believe it.

To support their claim that costs can be radically reduced without adverse effects, the health planners point to the fact that about half of all hospital costs are for patients in the last year of life. I don't find that persuasive. Do doctors really know which of their very ill patients will benefit from expensive care and which will die regardless of the care they receive? In a world of uncertainty, many of us will want to hope that care will help.

We are also often told that patients in Minnesota receive many fewer dollars of care per capita than patients in New York and California without adverse health effects. When I hear that, I wonder whether we should cut back on care, as these experts advocate, move to Minnesota, or wish we had the genetic stock of Minnesotans.

The administration's health planners believe that the new ''cost effectiveness research'' will allow officials to eliminate wasteful spending by defining the ''appropriate'' care that will be paid for by the government and by private insurance. Such a constrained, one-size-fits-all form of medicine may be necessary in some European health programs in which the government pays all the bills. But Americans have shown that we prefer to retain a diversity of options and the ability to choose among doctors, hospitals and standards of care.

At a time when medical science offers the hope of major improvements in the treatment of a wide range of dread diseases, should Washington be limiting the available care and, in the process, discouraging medical researchers from developing new procedures and products? Although health care is much more expensive than it was 30 years ago, who today would settle for the health care of the 1970s?

Obama has said that he would favor a British-style ''single payer'' system in which the government owns the hospitals and the doctors are salaried but that he recognizes that such a shift would be too disruptive to the health-care industry. The Obama plan to have a government insurance provider that can undercut the premiums charged by private insurers would undoubtedly speed the arrival of such a single-payer plan. It is hard to think of any other reason for the administration to want a government insurer when there is already a very competitive private insurance market that could be made more so by removing government restrictions on interstate competition.

There is much that can be done to improve our health-care system, but the Obama plan is not the way to do it. One helpful change that could be made right away is fixing the COBRA system so that middle-income households that lose their insurance because of early retirement or a permanent layoff are not deterred by the cost of continuing their previous coverage.

Now that congressional leaders have made it clear that Obama will not see health legislation until at least the end of the year, the president should look beyond health policy and turn his attention to the problems that are impeding our economic recovery.

FURTHER CHANGES TO S. CON. RES. 13

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, section 401(c)(4) of S. Con. Res. 13, the 2010 budget resolution, permits the chairman of the Senate Budget Committee to adjust the section 401(b) discretionary spending limits, allocations pursuant to section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, and aggregates for legislation making appropriations for fiscal years 2009 and 2010 for overseas deployments and other activities by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes and so designated pursuant to section 401(c)(4). The adjustment is limited to the total amount of budget authority specified in section 104(21) of S. Con. Res. 13. For 2009, that limitation is $90.745 billion, and for 2010, it is $130 billion.

On June 25, 2009, the Senate Appropriations Committee reported H.R. 2847, the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2010, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. The reported legislation contains $126 million in funding that has been designated for overseas deployments and other activities pursuant to section 401(c)(4). The Congressional Budget Office estimates that the $126 million in budget authority will result in $104 million in new outlays in 2010. As a result, I am revising both the discretionary spending limits and the allocation to the Senate Committee on Appropriations for discretionary budget authority and outlays by those amounts in 2010. When combined with previous adjustments made pursuant to section 401(c)(4), $379 million has been designated so far for overseas deployments and other activities for 2010.

In addition, section 401(c)(2)(B) of the 2010 budget resolution permits the chairman to adjust the section 401(b) discretionary spending limits, allocations pursuant to section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and aggregates for legislation making appropriations for fiscal year 2010 that both appropriates $7.1 billion and provides an additional appropriation of up to $890 million to the Internal Revenue Service for enhanced tax enforcement to address the tax gap, the difference between the amount of taxes owed and the amount of taxes paid.

On July 9, 2009, the Senate Appropriations Committee reported S. 1432, the financial services and general government appropriations Bill, 2010. The reported bill contains $890 million in funding that satisfies the conditions of section 401(c)(2)(B). The Congressional Budget Office estimates that the $890 million in budget authority will result in $837 million in new outlays in 2010. As a result, I am revising both the discretionary spending limits and the allocation to the Senate Committee on Appropriations for discretionary budget authority and outlays by those amounts in 2010.

When combining the effects of the two adjustments, I am revising today both the discretionary spending limits and the allocation to the Senate Committee on Appropriations by a total of $1,016 million for budget authority and $941 million for outlays.

I ask unanimous consent to have the following revisions to S. Con. Res. 13 printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010—S. CON. RES. 13; FURTHER REVISIONS TO THE CONFERENCE AGREEMENT PURSUANT TO SECTIONS 401(c)(4) AND 401(c)(2)(B) TO THE ALLOCATION OF BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAYS TO THE SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE AND THE SECTION 401(b) SENATE DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS

In millions of dollars	Current Allocation/ Limit	Adjustment	Revised Allocation/Limit
FY 2009 Discretionary Budget Authority	1,482,201	0	1,482,201
FY 2009 Discretionary Outlays	1,247,872	0	1,247,872
FY 2010 Discretionary Budget Authority	1,086,269	1,016	1,087,285
FY 2010 Discretionary Outlays	1,306,259	941	1,307,200

WASP CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, it is the responsibility of my committee colleagues and I to oversee and consider legislation to award Congressional Gold Medals to prospective candidates deemed worthy of the honor. Indeed, it is the highest honor that Congress can bestow on an individual or group, and as such, my committee has to ensure that these bills garner broad bipartisan support in the form of two-thirds cosponsorship in the Senate before they can receive full consideration. This year, I am pleased that a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the Women Airforce Service Pilots, or

WASP, secured my committee's approval and passed the Senate unanimously on May 20, 2009.

This bill, authored by Senators HUTCHISON and MIKULSKI, recognizes the brave actions of more than a thousand women who served our country so courageously during World War II. Their patriotism and sacrifice were essential to our war effort. Quite simply, they were responsible for transporting critical military aircraft throughout the United States. Ferrying over 12,000 aircraft, of nearly 80 different types, these groundbreaking women operated war machines, from the fabled B–29 Superfortress to the lethal P–51 Mustang fighter. The purpose of their missions was to prepare these aircraft for combat and ensure their readiness.

The WASPs were so effective that they logged over 50 percent of these kinds of missions for our Nation, flying more than 60 million miles over the course of the war. Their likes included Jacqueline Cochran, one of the greatest female pilots of all time, who was chosen to be the director of the WASPs flight training. Jacqueline set the women's U.S. high altitude and international speed records and was also the winner of the coveted Bendix trophy in 1938. During the famous air race, she earned an epic victory flying from Los Angeles to Cleveland in just over 8 hours. Jacqueline was further commended for her service during the war when she was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal, the highest decoration she could have received from the military without being recognized as an Active-Duty servicemember. When the war ended, Jacqueline's passion for flying would drive her to set new aviation records, becoming the first female pilot to fly a bomber across the Atlantic. Additionally, six WASPs are still living in my home State of Connecticut. One of them, Gloria Heath, flew a dangerous mission as a B–26 bomber pilot, flying at 6,000 feet while towing a banner that fighter pilots would use for target practice during live fire exercises. Now Gloria is nationally recognized as a leader in aviation safety, having served as a founding board member of the Flight Safety Foundation. She also established an international safety information dissemination service to provide a unified, global response to emergencies on the land, in the air, and on the sea. Her pioneering efforts to ensure the safety of pilots and travelers all over the world have undoubtedly saved lives. Throughout her endeavors, Gloria never lost sight of her lifelong commitment to flying. She would become the director of summer aviation programs at Connecticut College, helping young students discover their passion for flight, just as she did half a decade before.

But these women did more than just serve our country they were also pioneers for women's rights. They will forever have the honor of being the first female aviators in American military history, serving as the forerunners to women's equality in the Armed Forces. In doing so, they paved the way for women's rights in the military and other workforces across the country. And although much still remains to be done to eradicate gender discrimination, women military combat pilots are now flying alongside their brothers in arms a true testament to the barriers broken down by the WASPs more than six decades ago.

These women often faced scorn and ridicule, but they refused to back down in their conviction that they could fly as proficiently as men. Ultimately, they were proven right and demonstrated that success should be measured in terms of merit and talent, not by gender.

Therefore it is with great pride and honor, Mr. President, that I support this bill. I commend Senators HUTCHISON and MIKULSKI for all their hard work and join them in their gratitude for the pioneering women of the WASP program.

INSPECTORS GENERAL

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I, Senator CHUCK GRASSLEY, intend to object to the proceeding to H.R. 885, the Improved Financial and Commodity Markets Oversight and Accountability Act, and a similar Senate bill, S. 1354, dated July 29, 2009, for the following reasons.''

I object to provisions regarding inspectors general in H.R. 885, and a similar Senate bill, S. 1354, based on my reading of the language in the Improved Financial and Commodity Markets Oversight and Accountability Act. The act is intended to require Presidential appointments and Senate confirmation for the following five inspectors general: Commodity Futures Trading Commission, CFTC; the National Credit Union Administration, NCUA; the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, PBGC; the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, FRB; and the Securities and Exchange Commission.

In essence, the act will change dramatically the historical and longstanding classification of these five organizations from ''designated federal entities'' DFE, under the original Inspector General Act of 1978, to Presidential appointees.

These IGs, who are all nonpartisan civil servants, oppose H.R. 885. I have come to agree with their conclusion that the act will neither improve the independence of the five IGs nor enhance their accountability to the American people. Requiring that these five IGs be made Presidential appointees introduces the potential for partisan politics where none currently exists. This is especially true because we have an administration that is not even a year old and three IGs have already been dismissed. I have not yet seen a consistent policy reason articulated for treating these five IGs differently from other DFE IGs. If Congress wants to increase the independence and accountability of all inspectors general, there are numerous, more effective ways of doing so, and I would be eager to work toward that common goal. However, this legislation has not had a full and, complete hearing in the Senate, targets only five of the DFE inspectors general for reasons that are unclear, and does not appear to achieve its stated purpose.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I thank Senator KYL and Senator LEVIN for working out a second-degree amendment last week to Senator KYL's earlier amendment, No. 1760, to the National Defense Authorization Act relating to the post-START agreement that the United States is negotiating with the Russian Federation. In my view, the earlier amendment—and section 1239 of the House version of the NDAA, on which that amendment was based—would have undermined the constitutional role of the Senate as the body that considers treaties, as well as the President's role in negotiating treaties. The Senate decided wisely not to adopt the House approach of trying to bar U.S. compliance with a treaty before the treaty has even been negotiated. The substitute amendment we adopted last week was a good result.

The bill approved by the Senate, as amended by Senator KYL's modified amendment, would require the President to report to the Congress on his plan to enhance the safety, security and reliability of the U.S. nuclear weapons stockpile, to modernize the nuclear weapons complex, and to maintain the delivery platforms. I would encourage the administration to see that requirement not as a burden, but as an opportunity. If U.S. ratification of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty is to be approved by the Senate, Members will have to be convinced that the executive branch is prepared to sustain our nuclear deterrence by maintaining a stockpile of safe, secure, and reliable nuclear weapons, without resorting to nuclear testing. This report requirement underscores that concern and the need to address it forthrightly.

I believe that this administration has the will to maintain our nuclear stockpile, and the successes of stockpile stewardship over the last decade have been greater than even its proponents predicted when we last considered CTBT. The report required by this amendment would offer an opportunity to explain to the Senate how far we have come, where we are going next, and how we will fund stockpile stewardship to ensure that we will sustain our deterrent posture even as the United States works with other countries to reduce the numbers and importance of these weapons worldwide. It may be only a preliminary report, if